

# THE CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN.

---

No. XVI.—APRIL, 1880.

---

## THE PROTESTANT OUTLOOK.

IN certain quarters it is confidently affirmed that the force of Protestantism is almost spent. We are informed that what was once a mighty stream is coming to an ignoble end, wasting its waters in a hundred desultory channels, or disappearing in the barren sands of unbelief. All our English sacerdotalists maintain that Protestantism is a failure. It cannot preserve religion. Men must be Catholics or infidels; no other position is any longer tenable. It is what the controversialists of the Latin Church have always said. The more fanatical party at Rome seem to have dreamed that the late Pope, by holding a (so-called) Œcumenical Council, might give the *coup de grace* to the long-hated Protestantism which, in their estimation, had brought modern society to the brink of ruin. No one was, or professed to be, more sanguine on the point than Cardinal Manning. Shortly before the Council of the Vatican assembled, he wrote, "The Council of Trent fixed the epoch after which Protestantism never spread. The next General Council will probably date the period of its dissolution." \* What egregious misstatement and miscalculation! Since the Council of Trent, Protestantism has spread enormously; and at this day it will bear more favourable comparison with its great rival than at any former period, as respects numerical, intellectual, political, or moral forces. And as to the Council of the Vatican, from which the Jesuits augured such great results, truly, so far as Protestantism is concerned, from the mountains in travail there has scarcely appeared anything so large as a mouse. The Council met and vaunted great things, and then dispersed; but no Reformed Church so much as quivered. In fact, the Council has been rather serviceable to Protestantism. It has managed to make the ecclesiastical system which has its centre at Rome more autocratic than ever—a result which provokes the watchfulness of European governments and the angry contempt of the democracy. It has propounded a

\* "The Centenary of St. Peter and the General Council," p. 90.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

dogma which was intended to bring all mankind, in domestic and civil, as well as individual life, to the feet of the Pope, but which has rather had the happy effect of making his claims more incredible and intolerable than ever to modern intelligence. An educated man may be found here and there sufficiently fanatical to say with M. Veuillot, "There is only one man in the world who knows anything, and he is the Pope." But educated men generally, even in Roman Catholic countries, will shrug their shoulders at such extravagances of Popery. The Count Montalembert was so disgusted with the exaltation of the Pope by the Jesuits, that, ardent as he had been all his lifetime in the cause of the Church, he spoke on his deathbed of "the idol they have set up for themselves at the Vatican." His friend, Père Hyacinthe, has reached the conviction that modern French Popery is a kind of Paganism, and says that it has "two idols—one male, the other female; the male idol is the Pope, the female idol the Virgin Mary." \*

But though Popery (the word is not meant offensively, but is really more appropriate than ever to denote the complete subjection of the Latin Church to the Pope) be weakened by its own insane pride and intolerance, it does not follow that Protestantism is proportionately strengthened. It may even be held that weakness in the one involves weakness in the other also. It would,—it must be so, if the Reformation produced only a protest against abuses, or was itself no more than a revolt, to use Guizot's expression, "an insurrection of the human mind against the absolute power of the spiritual order." A protest cannot be perpetually repeated without weariness. A revolt cannot be maintained for centuries at its original strength; and its impulse dies out all the more if it has to a great extent succeeded, so that the power which it resisted is sensibly reduced. In this sense it may be allowed that, as Popery declines, Protestantism declines also.

But the Reformation had much more in it than a movement of protest and resistance. It had a very decided affirmative and constructive character. And we look round us with some anxiety, in the end of the nineteenth century, to see how it fares with that movement for a Bible-guided Church and an evangelical Christianity which the Reformers in the sixteenth century so vigorously began.

It is a difficult question. The field over which we look in order to gather our impressions is a far wider and more various one than that which Luther, Melancthon, and Calvin influenced. Over this great area, which is called the Christian world, there is a constant fluctuation of opinion, with ever so many currents and cross currents of intellectual and religious or irreligious persuasion. No statistics can present to us the real state of the case. How will you tabulate the multitudes who are absolutely indifferent to religion of any description? and where will you place our Anglicans who are neither Protestants nor Romanists; our Positivists who are Catholics without being Christians; and our Agnostics,

\* "Paganism in Paris," *Nineteenth Century*, Feb., 1880.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

who may admire "the lifting power of an ideal" which men choose to call divine, but are quite resolved to know nothing in divinity except that nothing is known?

Cost what it may to us in numbers, we decline to take all sorts of unbelievers and misbelievers under the wings of Protestantism. The term is loosely employed to include all who, on whatever ground, reject the domination of the Bishop of Rome over human reason and conscience; and this suits the opposite controversialists well. They gain a great advantage by mixing up all "non-Catholics" as Brother Protestants, and classing Socinians, Freethinkers, Mormons, Shakers, and Spiritualists, as the allies of the oldest, gravest, and most steadfast Reformed Churches; for so they can represent Protestantism as a multifarious medley of all religions and no religion, in rebellion against the one consistent, unchanging, unwavering Church. But such classifications are mere tricks of controversy, and utterly unjust. We know that liberty has its inconveniences; and the party of freedom in the Church, as in the State, must submit to be taunted with its differences. We are willing to bear the inconvenience and the taunt rather than lose the freedom. But the divisions within Protestantism, properly so called, are one thing; the assignment to it of all the religious vagaries to be found under a Christian name is quite another thing. To the latter we demur. While the Roman controversialist stands on the authentic Roman ground, with the Council of Trent, the creed of Pope Pius IV., the Syllabus of Pope Pius IX., and the Council of the Vatican to support him, surely we have a right to demand that those only shall be recognised, as exponents of the Reformation and its results, who are in some fair measure of harmony with the Protestant Confessions—i.e., with those enunciations of Divine truth which gave to that great movement its inspiration and success.

We propose to fasten our attention on some of the chief characteristics of the Reformation three centuries ago, and to consider what is its condition to-day in these respects, and what are its prospects.

1. *Nationalism.*—Every one knows that the Reformation allied itself to national life and patriotic spirit. It maintained the rights of civil government against the encroachments of ecclesiastical power. It gave nerve and permanence to the protest of princes and peoples against the all-grasping Pope and Roman Curia. It appealed to national sentiments of independence and self-respect; and if in this way it came to have more of a political complexion than spiritual movements ought to have, it must be remembered that it thus secured to itself a measure of most necessary protection. In those days, no one understood religious liberty. There were those in high places in Europe who would have exulted in making a speedy end of Protestantism by fire and sword; and for the Protestants to have stood simply on rights of conscience would have been to deliver themselves up to scornful and merciless enemies. They needed a bulwark behind which Reformed Churches might live and grow; and they found it in the principle of national independence.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

Luther was conspicuously indebted to courageous princes and the sturdy temper of the German people. As the world then was, Church reforms were impossible without some concurrence on the part of national authorities. In England, the form of religion and the mode of worship were prescribed by the Crown and Parliament. In Scotland, the new order of things was settled by the Estates of the Parliament. On the Continent, all through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the "Protestant Interest" was regarded as very much an affair in the hands of kings and statesmen. It was affected by the rivalries of courts, the caprice of princes, the fortunes of war, and the provisions contained in treaties of peace.

To a great extent, this characteristic of Protestantism is now modified. There are National Reformed Churches still; but no one thinks of the Reformed religion as headed by the Protestant princes, and ranged under just so many national banners. It is no longer wished or expected that civil governments should determine the faith or worship of Christian people. Not even the most resolute defenders of the hereditary connection of Church and State put their trust in princes for the guidance of the Church or the propagation of the Gospel. Many ardent Protestants contend for the complete severance of the Church from the State; others deny that this is wise,—that it is even possible. It is a question which we shall not discuss in this place. But this is what we point to as a significant fact,—that Protestantism, while still in harmony with national life and spirit, no longer requires the steadying hand and protecting sword of national governments; nor is it restricted or extended, to any perceptible degree, by the will of civil rulers. More and more it relies on the unconstrained attachment of those who believe the Gospel and love "the simplicity which is toward Christ."

2. *Biblicism*.—The Reformation was eminently a Biblical movement. It sought an authority external to that Church which had overlaid and stifled the Gospel by its traditions, and it found that authority in the Bible. Therefore, to translate the Bible, to circulate it, to interpret it grammatically and honestly, to read it in churches in the vulgar tongue, were objects of the greatest urgency,—were the strongest weapons to be found against the Church of Rome. Luther, Calvin, and Tyndale took the right way to counteract all the decretals and menaces that Rome could issue. They caused men to know the Holy Scriptures, and to bow down before the supreme authority of the Word of God. By this Word, Popes and Councils, decrees, traditions, usages, ceremonies, dogmas—all were to be tried and judged.

Is this characteristic fading from our modern Protestantism? Does not the Bible retain its place of authority on our reading-desks and pulpits? Is it not read in our families and schools as the incomparable and inspired Book? Yes. But while Protestantism has rescued the Bible from being hidden in an unknown tongue, and from the incubus of a traditional authorised interpretation, it has brought it into a new



CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

danger of being depreciated in value by rationalising interpreters, or actually cut to pieces by the destructive critics. Through this ordeal it has been passing, in a very marked manner, during the present generation; and unlearned lovers of the Bible have been thrown, more than once, into a panic at the questions which are mooted, and the liberties which seem to be taken with the venerated volume.

Protestantism, however, is true to its original Biblicism when it encourages honest and competent criticism. It must spare no pains to ascertain what the sacred text really is,—in other words, what it is that the Spirit of God has really caused to be written for our learning; because it is not the letter of this version or that, but the Holy Spirit who, in and through the word of truth—*i.e.*, the original text—determines our Christian faith and duty. To decry criticism is to play the part of a timid bigot, not that of a good Protestant. The Bible cannot suffer damage from the most thorough scrutiny. If there arises a school of criticism which is wild and unsettling in its tone, let it die of its unreason, or let it be corrected by a more reverential spirit, allied with a better judgment and a sounder scholarship.

In some quarters there are symptoms of anti-Biblicism, which, if they increase, bode ill for the Protestant cause, and indeed for all Christian belief. There are Protestants—sons, at all events, of Protestant ancestors—who declaim against submission to a book, stigmatise it as a sort of pious *fetish*, and propose to get rid of it more easily and rapidly than even by the disintegrating process of historical criticism. They would relegate it to the position of interesting old sacred literature, and place it on the same shelf with the Vedas, the Zend-Avesta, and the Koran. They maintain that, if there be a God, and we may know Him, the moral and spiritual intuitions of man will perceive Him, not in one ancient volume only, but in all good books, dispositions, and actions, and in every arrangement of order and beauty in the universe. Now, we know no one who denies that the Supreme Perfection is, to some degree, revealed in all goodness and beauty; but none the less is it true that man needs a more definite revelation of Him who is most High, most Holy, and most merciful,—of His will, the principles of His moral government, and the relation of things seen to things unseen. This is what our fathers found in the Bible, and nowhere else. For any of their children to put that Bible on a par with old poems and legends of the Hindus and Persians, or with the confused and narrow-minded Koran, is little else than an insult to the Church of all ages, and an outrage on the spiritual consciousness and the dearest hopes and consolations of all Christendom. To tell us that, however former generations may have needed the Bible, men of our time can dispense with its help, seems to us a gross piece of ingratitude to that Book of books which has in large measure kindled the intelligence that is now supposed to eclipse and supersede it, and an equally gross exaggeration of that reign of reason and that “natural religion” of which we have often heard great

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

things, but from which we have seen only very feeble and scanty results.

To anti-Biblicism of this sort, Protestantism, if well-advised, will yield not an inch of ground. It is, and must continue to be, Biblical—as critically as you please, as candidly as possible—but always reverentially and believingly Biblical. As Antæus renewed his strength whenever he touched the earth, so is Protestantism made strong by frequent contact with the Word. We do not quite accept Chillingworth's famous phrase, "The Bible alone the religion of Protestants." Christ Himself is our religion, for He is our life. He reproached those who, though they possessed, did not search the Scriptures, and yet assumed that in them they had eternal life, while they would not come to Him, the Quickener, of whom the Scriptures testified.\* Enough to say,—and it is all that Chillingworth meant, or needed to maintain,—that the Bible is the sacred repository of Divine revelation, the source of our knowledge of the Divine character and will, and the sole authoritative standard of appeal in regard to Christian belief and conduct.

The interpretation of the Bible is not with us fixed and perfected. There is a science of Hermeneutics—a living, progressive science. We encourage our scholars to devote themselves to this science, and hold that each generation should make an advance in exegetical accuracy. We also most anxiously desire that our divines should so handle the Bible as to exhibit its organic unity under diversity; state correctly, and neither overstate nor understate, what is meant by its being Theopneustic,—man-written, but God-breathed; and apply a true historical perspective to what is really a series of compositions stretching over a very long period in the authorship, and avowedly referring to a succession of religious dispensations. The Biblicism of the future may not quote texts exactly in the same way as that of the Reformers or of the Puritans; but Biblicism there must be, or Protestantism dies, and infidelity and superstition divide the world between them.

3. *Confessionism*.—The Confessions of Faith compiled in the sixteenth century, were not creeds to be said by the people in public worship after the manner in which the symbol commonly called "The Apostles' Creed" is used. They were manifestoes to Christendom; and they did good and timely service in exhibiting the unity of faith among the Protestants at large, and in giving firmness and definiteness to the whole movement which was changing the face of Northern and Western Europe. They furnished a triumphant answer to the charge that the Reformation was a mere destructive work which could put nothing but negation and confusion in place of the long-established beliefs of the whole Western Church.

How is it with these venerable documents now? The Augsburg Confession, the Heidelberg Catechism, the Gallican Confession, the Thirty-Nine Articles—in how far do they express the Protestant

\* John v. 39, 40.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

theology of to-day? We do not mention the Scottish Confessions, for they have long ago been pushed aside to make room for the English Puritan symbol, the Westminster Confession of Faith. What strikes us is, that the old Confessions still cover the Protestant theology, but fit clumsily. They are like garments made for men of a former generation. They are tight at the wrong place, and roomy at the wrong place. They are too long, and not broad enough. They emphasise some matters that do not now seem so momentous, and omit, or very inadequately treat, other matters which have risen into great prominence. They protest loudly against errors which scarcely trouble us, and make vehement assertions which modern theologians would be inclined to subdue or modify.

This is not to be wondered at, or counted to the discredit of our old Confessions. It is unavoidable in the course of centuries, and it is not undesirable that alterations should take place in the view which is taken of particular controversies, or in the importance attached to certain modes of conceiving and defining religious truth.\*

Some Protestants have rid themselves of all awkwardness by laying aside the venerable garments of a formulated theology—i.e., by abandoning all historical Confessions. They are content to group themselves in flocks here and there, on an implied basis of faith and love, and a general agreement in doctrine expressed by every one in his own words, or not expressed at all. This they regard as practically sufficient for present fellowship; and they trust the future to Christian love and freedom. Now, whatever may be said for this plan, it is quite obvious that under it we could have had no Reformation. On this principle, no cohesive Church of any magnitude can exist; and only cohesive Churches with compacted strength could have borne the strain of the sixteenth century. Accordingly, the Churches which take their mould and stamp from that great epoch, organised themselves on an explicit declaration of common faith; and they cannot abandon their Confessions, because they must not let themselves crumble to pieces, or lose their historical continuity. What they do in most cases, or try to do, is to hold in honour their inherited Confessions, Catechisms, and Articles, and to interpret them generously, not insisting on every phrase as though it were the best possible, or on every assertion as if it were divinely inspired; but keeping well within the lines of the ancestral theology, while giving to their teaching the new setting which longer study warrants, and duty to the present time requires—new balancings, new adjustments, new shadings, new expansions. It is not easy to see what other course they could follow if they would be loyal, not only to the past, but also to the present; and not to the present only, but also to the past.

It is not disputed that this mode of dealing with Confessions and

\* See Rev. Dr. Schaff's Paper on "The Consensus of the Reformed Confessions" in Proceedings of First General Presbyterian Council. 1877.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

Articles of Faith covers some dangers. The elasticity of interpretation which is assumed, or permitted, may degenerate into latitudinarianism, protected by orthodox forms of words. It is a question for the decision of each of the Reformed Churches, whether to run this risk under the old symbols, or to construct new documents in more exact harmony with present convictions of truth, and require a strict adherence to them. Several of the smaller and more recently constituted Reformed communities on the Continent, being free to make a fresh start, have framed for themselves brief and simple Confessions, which maintain the leading truths asserted in the longer documents of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but leave a large number of secondary questions open or undefined.

On the whole, the time seems to us to be ripening, not at all for an abandonment of Confessions, but for a revival and abridgment of them in the interest alike of a living orthodoxy and a growing charity.

4. *Intellectualism.*—We use the term to indicate the alliance with learning, and the zeal for the spread of all true knowledge, which so honourably distinguished the Church Reformers of the sixteenth century. We know that Erasmus, in an irritated mood, attributed to the Lutheran movement in Germany an unfavourable influence on those classical and philosophical studies which he cultivated:—“*Ubiunque regnat Lutheranismus, ibi literarum est interitus.*” But Hallam, in quoting this sentence, adds, “There were, however, at this time as well as afterwards, more learned men on the side of the Reformation than on that of the Church.\*” In Scotland, there was no useful learning till the time of George Buchanan. In England, the schools and universities improved vastly in the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI., declined when the Reformation was checked under Queen Mary, but at once revived when Elizabeth began to reign, and recalled the Protestant exiles, whom Hallam describes as “being far the most learned men of the kingdom.”

How stands Protestantism towards erudition and intellectual culture at the present day? Having done so much to liberate the human mind from fetters, is it now afraid of the consequences? Has it grown suspicious of learning, its ancient ally? It is sometimes alleged that evangelical Protestantism has taken fright at both science and criticism, and gives evidence of intellectual timidity and narrowness. Mr. Froude says bluntly, in one of his essays, that “the Protestantism of the nineteenth century has parted company with intellect and practical force.” Now, this is a matter of which men will judge according to their individual observation and experience; but we venture to maintain that Mr. Froude’s charge is absurdly overstated. The Protestant nations are those which excel in intelligence and practical ability; and they do so because of the mental activity which the Reformed Churches induce and exercise. At the same time, we do not deny that some colour has been given to im-

\* “Literary History.” Vol. i., p. 302. Fourth Edition.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1889.]

putations of *obscurantism* by a foolish habit, indulged by certain evangelical speakers and writers, of stigmatising researches and discoveries which they do not well know how to handle, as "oppositions of science falsely so called," and encountering sceptical books with shrieks of fear and screams of denunciation, instead of patient counter study and effective reply. One thing is very plain to us as we survey the intellectual currents of the modern world. If the Protestant cause is to be kept above the reach of contumely, it must be conducted with perfect candour, with large toleration, and with a fearless acceptance of all that can be shown on its proper evidence to be true. It must make an honest use of science and learning, march abreast of the higher and the highest education, and, while it appeals as strongly and kindly as ever to "the common people," must not fall out of sympathy with the needs and aspirations of the most gifted and cultivated minds. If, unfortunately, such minds drift more and more into alienation from all revealed religion, the fault will not lie entirely on the superstitious Christianity of Rome. A timid, narrow-minded Protestantism must share the blame.

5. *Fraternalism*.—Three centuries ago, those who renounced the Papal yoke were formed, as we have seen, into National Churches. These regarded each other as component parts of the universal visible Church; and though they were separately administered and governed, they cultivated brotherly relations so far as the times allowed, and their leading divines maintained a cordial correspondence, of which the Zurich Letters form a noble specimen. There was, indeed, the serious variance between the Lutherans and the Reformed; but Calvin was ecclesiastically liberal, and never let this dispute interrupt his brotherly feeling for Luther and his followers. He declared that, in his judgment, the Lutheran peculiarities were of small account in comparison with the great things of salvation on which all Protestants were agreed.

But it must be confessed that the history of Protestantism has been marked by "variations" which gave the skilful Bossuet a provoking controversial advantage—in fact, by a bewildering growth of sects and parties; and though, for the last forty years, there have been earnest protests against sectarianism, and cries for Christian union, the aspect of Protestantism at the present day is painfully incoherent. Parties are formed, and even separate, and quite independent Churches are organised on the same soil, to represent all fashions of religious thought and ecclesiastical order, till many of our best people have become quite ashamed of "the list of denominations," and ask why Christian society may not be reconstructed on a basis simpler, kinder, and more dignified.

Not that Protestantism should be, or can be, centralised like Romanism; but it surely may be, in some degree, reconciled to itself, and harmonised on the principle of Christian fraternity. The grounds which require and justify separate organisation may very well be re-studied in the light of the Bible and of Post-Reformation Church History. If this could be done without prejudice, and if practical issues were not complicated with



questions of sacred orders, ministerial training, accumulated property, and the like, we are confident that Churches which now are so much at one that they have to be at pains to show why they stand apart, would find their way to coalesce amidst applause far wider and deeper than ever hailed their separation. Not only so, but between Protestant Churches that cannot coalesce, such fraternal relations may at all events be established as will enable and require each army corps, in our great host, to salute every other on the same side in the battle of the faith, and cause each to feel that ground gained from the common enemy anywhere is gain to the common cause, and ought to be matter of rejoicing to all.

Sects, no doubt, have been formed on trivial and even presumptuous grounds, and these are open to reproof for having broken Christian fellowship with insufficient cause. But disapproval quite as strong is deserved by older and larger Churches when they display a haughty, non-fraternal spirit. With great regret we are obliged to point such reproach at the Church of England. Every one knows in what good relations that Church once stood towards the Reformed Churches of Western Europe, recognising the orders of their clergy, and receiving counsel from their leading divines. But all this is changed. Those of the Anglican clergy and laity who honour the Reformation are bound up closely with those who deplore and even detest that movement; while they are separated from their fellow-Protestants, both at home and abroad, by an exclusiveness that savours of Archbishop Laud, but not of the English Reformers. It is strange that they do not perceive how their isolation from the great forces of non-prelatic Protestantism plays directly into the hands of the party of reaction, and weakens their own position and the Protestant interest at large. If their eyes were opened to this, and if they could pluck up courage enough to make common cause, openly and avowedly, with the Reformed Churches of Europe and America, they would both give and receive an impulse, and awaken an enthusiasm which has not been felt in this cause for at least two hundred years.

6. *Liberalism.*—At the period of the Reformation, princes and courts were more absolute, and people more ignorant and subject than they are now, and the original forms of Protestantism were unavoidably constructed to suit the contemporary state of society. Yet the Reformation showed, from the beginning, a favourable aspect toward civil liberty. In this respect, the Scottish Reformers deserve most honourable mention. In John Knox's conversations with Queen Mary, and more fully in George Buchanan's treatise, "*De jure regni apud Scotos*," we find the first utterances of constitutional government, in opposition to the old tradition of the divine and indefeasible right of princes. These far-seeing men maintained the duties as well as the rights of princes, and the rights as well as duties of the people.

The adaptation of Protestantism to be the spiritual guide of modern political freedom, is a theme which needs to be carefully thought out.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

It is plain that, in our time, an irresistible stream of tendency carries the nations towards government of the people by the people—*i.e.*, by those whom they select and trust to act for their welfare and in their name; and the question presses, what mode or type of religion is to be associated with this movement, in order to give it steadiness and moral safety? It is impossible that this can be the religion which has its head and inspiration at the Vatican. Whatever one may think of the influence of the Roman Catholic Church on society at former periods—and it has not been always or only injurious—no one can say that it is fitted to be the counsellor of governments really popular, or the guardian of nations really free. It is the most tremendous instance the world can show of centralised authority; and its views of education, of liberty of the press, and of social and political life, are notoriously at variance with the ideas and claims of modern civilisation. We see, therefore, in more than one Continental country, a bitter, and, indeed, unavoidable conflict, between liberal and patriotic politicians on the one hand, and the forces of clericalism on the other.

But is Protestantism prepared to keep step with the life and hope of progressive nations, and to supply that moral and spiritual element, without which, society, however educated, corrupts and perishes? It is a question which statesmen in Italy, France, Belgium, and some even in Spain, are beginning to ask. At such a time, how desirable it is that Protestantism of a warm, evangelical type should be invigorated by all fair means in those Continental countries where Romanism, from intellectual and political rather than distinctly religious causes, is losing credit; and that, all the world over, it should refuse to league itself with reactionary policy, or to hallow the reign of ancient ignorance and arbitrary will, but should promote the equitable adjustment of social problems that cut deep into human welfare, and should befriend and consecrate the onward march of nations in the use of freedom, the practice of righteousness, and the love of peace!

DONALD FRASER.

---

## THE WANING PRESTIGE OF THE MINISTRY.

IT is not the object of this paper to prove, nor will it be at all implied in it, that the prestige of the ministry is in all respects and everywhere lower than it has been in other days. It is not its object to show just where, or to what precise extent anywhere, the esteem in which the ministry has been held is declining. That there are no contrary tokens of increased respect and larger influence is not to be maintained. It is, however, assumed, as a thing not to be questioned, that to some extent, and in many parts of Christendom, the ministry does not enjoy the full consideration in which it has been held in former times.

It is assumed that the ministry encounters, frequently and widely, and in new forms, unfriendly and disparaging judgments, and is obliged to turn, for comfort and cheer, from men to the Lord who instituted it. The human judgment an apostle pronounces "a very small thing;" God's warrant for His servant's self-respect, this source of comfort and strength, is a satisfactory resource.

Signs are not far to seek that the minister's office is not magnified for him, either in society or in the Church itself, up to the measure of its right, or that of its frequent former experience. This condition of things not only works disastrously upon the present influence of the ministry, but also has a very direct and unfavourable bearing upon the prospects of the Church in this particular. In not a few of our communions, the young men who might formerly have been regarded as presumptive candidates for the sacred office are now largely looking in other directions. While a true ministry must always be one sought and called of God, and not one gained either by private tastes or public judgments and tendencies, the temper of the young men of the Church is no unimportant sign of the esteem in which the ministry is held. And this, in many of our religious bodies, is surely more discouraging at the present time than many tokens of light esteem on the side of culture and worldly society.

The object of this paper is to point out some of the causes of the condition of things of which these signs are exponents. They are in part external to the ministry itself, and also to the Church. To be aware of their existence, and of their unfavourable bearing upon the influence of the sacred office, can be only an advantage, even though it be impossible to remove or wholly to neutralise them. Another group of these malign influences is to be found within the Church, and even within the ministry, and should admit of easier and more complete remedy.

In the structure and temper of our modern society we find some of the causes which we are seeking to identify, and whose working we are attempting to trace.

1. It is of minor consequence, and yet not without its influence, that in many communities the social rank of the ministry is not what it once was. The sacred profession then carried with it, very generally, a patent at least of gentility. To be well born, and to belong to one of the learned professions, were in many places the two conditions of good social standing. And of the professions, the ministry was not the one least esteemed. Birth, under popular governments, if not under some monarchies, has come to be less valued. The ease with which access has been too often gained to the professions, and the frequent impossibility of recognising them as "learned" professions in the persons of many who belong to them, have worked in the same direction. On the other hand, wealth and success in business have been both disposed and allowed to challenge for themselves the consideration which belonged more exclusively to gentle blood and professional standing. As the result, the ministry, as

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

an office, does not win for its incumbent the deference with which he was once socially regarded.

2. But, further, our age is in general less deferential than its predecessors towards station and official dignity. A century has wrought a great change in this respect; and while the offensive demonstrations of the French Revolution are not now reproduced, men's heads have never since uncovered themselves so readily, and, in general, the gesture and the mien by which respect for station is shown, are used almost universally in scantier measure. So far as this results from a disposition to attach a higher value to manhood, there is here a gain that cannot be easily measured—a gain due, in larger degree than unbelief admits, to the Gospel and its ministry. To the unqualified claim of absolute equality among men, the Gospel can never be made sponsor. The very Word of God, which is the original source of all true views of the worth of manhood and the nature of brotherhood, and their most reliable and effective champion, guards no less energetically and sacredly the rights of ranks and dignities. Yet it is not those only who question the apostolic prerogatives of Peter and Jude that seem never to have read their sharp denunciations of such as "speak evil of dignities." By other tokens than this freedom of speech towards authorities, the very piety of our time is shown to be by no means a reverent piety. Witness the manifold irreverence of our common public worship.

Levelling impulses and tendencies seem to pervade the atmosphere which the Church cannot avoid breathing, but she should watch and strive, with vigilance and energy wrought of God, against their deleterious, undevout, impious characteristics and workings. Manhood is not the only precious thing whose rights are to be guarded; and manhood is not protected by attempts to remodel the divinely-appointed conditions of its welfare.

There is much that is plausible and much that is true in the declaration by which our modern iconoclasm justifies its assault upon dignity and station—that things are to be estimated by what they are, and not by the place which they occupy. And yet nothing is more obvious than that many things are not what they are, except in the places for which they were designed. However this may be, the ministry is continually reminded, and often told in the most refreshing Saxon, that it must justify itself and exert its power by what it is internally and potentially, and not by making much claim as an office. It seems not to have occurred to this levelling spirit, that, denying to the ministry the prestige of dignity and rank, it ought at least to attempt a definition of the ministry that should not begin with the idea of appointment, station, and official right.

3. The relative learning of the ministry is very possibly not what it was formerly. The wider diffusion of education among the masses, and the multiplication of inducements to, and opportunities for, special attainments, impose upon the classes and professions that were the peculiar

and privileged custodians of learning, the necessity of redoubled diligence, otherwise their vantage-ground is lost. As for the ministry itself, without debating the question whether our modern methods of theological education are altogether favourable to eminent learning, it cannot be doubted that many of the demands of the Church and of the age upon the ministry are decidedly unfavourable. The demand for popular talents and for numberless services makes learning an impossibility to all but the fewest and the rarest in the ministry of the Church. How a learning so solid, so varied, as to meet the requirements of these busy and exacting modern days, can be gained in the fragments of time left to one who has practically admitted the claims pressed upon him, with endless iteration, by pews, platform, Church machinery, pastoral work, social life, and—what not beside?—is a problem more easily propounded than solved favourably to learning. He who would accept these numberless inconsistent calls must pay the price of not being profound or complete in anything.

4. Another characteristic of the age which works unfavourably upon the esteem in which the ministry is held, is the wide-spread disposition to resent the assertion of authority in matters of belief. It would be easy to retort, that great names, or names that may be popular although not great, are used as spells to conjure with in philosophic or scientific coteries that are very suspicious of authority in religion. In the sphere of morals and religion, a part of the world is, beyond question, very suspicious of assertions and requirements made on the simple authority of God Himself, and loudly demands proofs and verifications. There are other men who crave a nearer and more palpable authority, and take the way to Rome.

The very nature of the Christian ministry, with the simple and only warrant for its existence, makes its proper and most characteristic utterances the announcements and demands of a supreme authority, and so bring it into instant and constant collision with the temper of which we are speaking. Where the world calls for intuitions, demonstrations, verifications, the legitimate and loyal ministry answers with a "Thus saith the Lord." Such a method of establishing truth and duty is, to the spirit of the age, illegitimate; and the prestige of a ministry that will not abdicate its highest function,—that of speaking as having authority,—waned as the spirit of the age prevails.

Other reasons for a decline in the estimation in which the ministry has been held, are to be found within the Church, and to some extent within the ministry itself.

1. Closely connected with that characteristic of the times to which attention was last directed, are the concessions which are too often made by the ministry to the temper of the age, in regard to the presentation and enforcement of revealed truth. These very properly and very surely impair the prestige of the ministry that will have recourse



CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

to them. A gospel adapted to the times by human adjustments is not the gospel that the times want. God's truths, put in God's way, are the truths that prove themselves adapted to all times; and for the very reason that they are not for any specific times, but for man in his great universal needs. Men professing to follow Apostolic example often utterly mistake the spirit in which, the extent to which, and the methods by which, they are to "be made all things to all men, that by all means they may save some." Especially is it the gravest error, meriting the most ignominious failure, to present all things that are supernaturally revealed as being to all intents and purposes, or to any extent and purpose, revealed or discoverable in any other way. The ministry that is afraid to say, anywhere and everywhere, "Thus saith the Lord," is plainly not called of God to His service in the Gospel. The words that He bids men speak are to be spoken as by His bidding, and not so as to hide as much as possible the fact of the bidding. Change their warrant, and you inevitably change their import and effect. The critical question often is, Will men receive them and act upon them as from God? Their utterance on any other warrant is an uncommissioned utterance, a human venture, in a sphere whose interests are too momentous for the intrusions of adventure. When the ministry resorts to philosophy to meet philosophy,—as though the Gospel, not being a philosophy, needed sometimes to be represented by a substitute, sometimes to be aided by an adjunct,—it enters an arena in which it can look only for natural as distinguished from spiritual victories, and takes the risks which are incident to all human encounters.

When the ministry allows the circumstances and peculiarities of its own time to fill larger space in its view than the permanent necessities of man and the eternal conditions and elements of its Divine commission, it will naturally and naturalistically emphasise the mode of stating and enforcing truth more than the truth itself. It comes of necessity to rely upon the moulding and adapting work of the herald, rather than upon the substance of the king's overture. The result is made to turn, in fact, upon human tact more than upon the Divine wisdom. And the world itself, knowing whom the ministry claims to represent, awards the simple justice of light esteem, if not of more serious contempt and censure, to these human improvers upon Divine methods.

2. The multiplying and magnifying of lay agencies and activities in the Church tend, unless carefully watched and guarded, to the depreciation of the importance and the functions of the ministry.

This is an age in which the Church, most happily for itself and for the world, has come to a more vivid apprehension of the obligation of the whole body, and of every part, to serve its Lord. Individual activity and organised activity, on the part of private Christians, have engaged thought and developed results beyond the experience of many former ages. The one danger to which our subject calls attention is this—

and privileged custodians of learning, the necessity of redoubled diligence, otherwise their vantage-ground is lost. As for the ministry itself, without debating the question whether our modern methods of theological education are altogether favourable to eminent learning, it cannot be doubted that many of the demands of the Church and of the age upon the ministry are decidedly unfavourable. The demand for popular talents and for numberless services makes learning an impossibility to all but the fewest and the rarest in the ministry of the Church. How a learning so solid, so varied, as to meet the requirements of these busy and exacting modern days, can be gained in the fragments of time left to one who has practically admitted the claims pressed upon him, with endless iteration, by pews, platform, Church machinery, pastoral work, social life, and—what not beside?—is a problem more easily propounded than solved favourably to learning. He who would accept these numberless inconsistent calls must pay the price of not being profound or complete in anything.

4. Another characteristic of the age which works unfavourably upon the esteem in which the ministry is held, is the wide-spread disposition to resent the assertion of authority in matters of belief. It would be easy to retort, that great names, or names that may be popular although not great, are used as spells to conjure with in philosophic or scientific coteries that are very suspicious of authority in religion. In the sphere of morals and religion, a part of the world is, beyond question, very suspicious of assertions and requirements made on the simple authority of God Himself, and loudly demands proofs and verifications. There are other men who crave a nearer and more palpable authority, and take the way to Rome.

The very nature of the Christian ministry, with the simple and only warrant for its existence, makes its proper and most characteristic utterances the announcements and demands of a supreme authority, and so bring it into instant and constant collision with the temper of which we are speaking. Where the world calls for intuitions, demonstrations, verifications, the legitimate and loyal ministry answers with a "Thus saith the Lord." Such a method of establishing truth and duty is, to the spirit of the age, illegitimate; and the prestige of a ministry that will not abdicate its highest function,—that of speaking as having authority,—waned as the spirit of the age prevails.

Other reasons for a decline in the estimation in which the ministry has been held, are to be found within the Church, and to some extent within the ministry itself.

1. Closely connected with that characteristic of the times to which attention was last directed, are the concessions which are too often made by the ministry to the temper of the age, in regard to the presentation and enforcement of revealed truth. These very properly and very surely impair the prestige of the ministry that will have recourse

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

to them. A gospel adapted to the times by human adjustments is not the gospel that the times want. God's truths, put in God's way, are the truths that prove themselves adapted to all times; and for the very reason that they are not for any specific times, but for man in his great universal needs. Men professing to follow Apostolic example often utterly mistake the spirit in which, the extent to which, and the methods by which, they are to "be made all things to all men, that by all means they may save some." Especially is it the gravest error, meriting the most ignominious failure, to present all things that are supernaturally revealed as being to all intents and purposes, or to any extent and purpose, revealed or discoverable in any other way. The ministry that is afraid to say, anywhere and everywhere, "Thus saith the Lord," is plainly not called of God to His service in the Gospel. The words that He bids men speak are to be spoken as by His bidding, and not so as to hide as much as possible the fact of the bidding. Change their warrant, and you inevitably change their import and effect. The critical question often is, Will men receive them and act upon them as from God? Their utterance on any other warrant is an uncommissioned utterance, a human venture, in a sphere whose interests are too momentous for the intrusions of adventure. When the ministry resorts to philosophy to meet philosophy,—as though the Gospel, not being a philosophy, needed sometimes to be represented by a substitute, sometimes to be aided by an adjunct,—it enters an arena in which it can look only for natural as distinguished from spiritual victories, and takes the risks which are incident to all human encounters.

When the ministry allows the circumstances and peculiarities of its own time to fill larger space in its view than the permanent necessities of man and the eternal conditions and elements of its Divine commission, it will naturally and naturalistically emphasise the mode of stating and enforcing truth more than the truth itself. It comes of necessity to rely upon the moulding and adapting work of the herald, rather than upon the substance of the king's overture. The result is made to turn, in fact, upon human tact more than upon the Divine wisdom. And the world itself, knowing whom the ministry claims to represent, awards the simple justice of light esteem, if not of more serious contempt and censure, to these human improvers upon Divine methods.

2. The multiplying and magnifying of lay agencies and activities in the Church tend, unless carefully watched and guarded, to the depreciation of the importance and the functions of the ministry.

This is an age in which the Church, most happily for itself and for the world, has come to a more vivid apprehension of the obligation of the whole body, and of every part, to serve its Lord. Individual activity and organised activity, on the part of private Christians, have engaged thought and developed results beyond the experience of many former ages. The one danger to which our subject calls attention is this—

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

that the satisfaction and strength and external success secured in connection with this diffused and quickened activity of the Church, may be misinterpreted. What had been wrongly imagined, or indolently suffered to be wholly within the sphere of ministerial activity, has been found in many particulars quite possible to private Christians. It is easy to pass, by reaction, from a condition of things in which the ministry was relied upon for too much, to a theory and practice that shall put away the counsel, guidance, and control which the Lord ordained for His Church.

The deeper breathing, the more vigorous pulse, the stronger arm, the more elastic step, satisfaction succeeding to weariness in work, new meanings discovered in the promises, new adequacy and adaptation found in the provisions of grace, are construed as tokens of a Divine approval of lay activity which only need further illustration in outward results. The responsibility for the old unprofitableness is adroitly transferred from the Church to the ministry, as though this had been the burden that kept down life. And so doctrines come to be practically held (the more dangerous because not formulated) that seriously limit the dignity and impair the power of the ministry.

Unordained evangelism,—and all the more because of signal blessings that have attended some of its conspicuous examples,—unless watched and regulated, with no jealousy for man, but all jealousy for God, will be a certain source of embarrassment to the ministerial office. There have been broached, in regard to the rights of laymen to administer, in emergencies, the sacraments of the Church, theories which, in some minds, involve a challenge of all peculiar privileges vested in the ministry with regard to these ordinances. The precarious tenure of the pastoral office in many parts of the Church, especially in America, with the consequent multiplication of responsibilities and duties upon the eldership and laity of such churches, tends in many ways to low estimates, both of the rights of, and the necessity for the ministry. The cheapness of more transient provision, the ease of escaping from unsatisfactory arrangements, and the facility with which fickle tastes can be gratified (though it be at the expense of all consecutive and solid ministrations), work with great effect against pastoral permanence, often against all pastoral relations whatsoever, and, as a last result, possibly against a fully ordained ministry. The religious press, a precious agency for good, makes it possible for most members of our congregations to read better sermons than they would hear, and they depreciate the spoken word. Sunday Schools, managed by Sunday-School Associations, which need not be constituted of, or controlled by Church members, are but an extreme illustration of an abounding associational work, which, by no means always in its design, but too often in its actual result, encroaches upon the functions both of the Church and its constituted authorities.

And so, in one way and another, from one side and another, within the Church itself, the ministry comes to be regarded too frequently as a

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

very special thing, as of doubtful convenience. The principles distinctly avowed by Plymouth Brethren, and the tendencies which have reached full development among them, exist, at least in germ, in many another connection, and cannot be too early or too closely watched.

3. Sensationalism, in all its phases and measures, resorted to by the ministry as a means of helping out the unattractiveness and unpalatableness of the Gospel of the grace of God, has greatly contributed to bring the ministry into disrepute. Every pulpit buffoon is a fearful incubus upon the sacred office with which he is connected. And others who think themselves far removed from revolting excesses in the mode of their preaching, show the taint of this evil tendency, and cater to the taste which finds its grossest gratification at other hands than theirs.

"Men must be brought, unscriptural men, to hear the Gospel before they can be benefited by it. You must keep hearers in their pews, or you cannot address them with line upon line, precept upon precept. *Can that which is unsavoury be eaten without salt?*" Is the natural heart, then, a fortress to be taken by stratagem, Gospel forces being brought in disguise into a stronghold which supposes itself to be admitting familiar and welcome visitants? The spiritual tastes of the new man are, by some Indian jugglery, to be brought to life and fruitfulness by a new, consummate art, playing at first and for a time upon the old natural tastes. These human devices and tricks are employed—are they?—"that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God." Is it, then, a true conclusion that these artifices do not display, and should not be supposed to display, the wisdom of men, and therefore do not fall under the apostle's stricture?

No rhetoric of the sensational ministry is more coruscating than that in which it declaims against the insipid and commonplace style of presenting truth, and sets forth the superior promise of a highly-seasoned Gospel. Nevertheless, the honest judgment of men will cling to the persuasion, that the pulpit which is in itself most invisible is most true to the Divine intention. Men are to be brought face to face with God for direct dealing with Him. And if, on the one hand, great care should be taken that the attention of men be not drawn away to the imperfections and deformities of God's messengers, on the other hand, it is an impertinence and an irreverence to offer His truth and Spirit the aid of the petty devices of the sophist, the composer, the declaimer, or the clown.

Sensationalism attaching itself to the life of religious societies, or to Church work, if less offensive, because not thrusting itself into so close connection with the very voice of God in His direct address to men, is none the less a warrant for esteeming more lightly the ministry that resorts to it. To assume that God does not understand human nature—that men can add important, essential elements to the system of agencies by which God's kingdom is to be built up—that the beauty and power of holiness in the Church need to be supplemented by attrac-



tions and expedients borrowed from high-pressure human societies—this shocks the sober and reverent mind.

The intrusion of this tendency, in any form whatever, into the domain of sacred things, disgusts the thoughtful portion of the Church. It provokes and justifies the scorn of the world, which is not to be made captive to Christ by any such shallow and unwholesome devices. It multiplies the difficulties of that portion of the ministry which, both from taste and from profound and solemn conviction, shrinks from the use of all such artifices. It repels from the ministry not a few of the choicest young men of the Church, who, finding what are the conditions of *éclat* and reputed success in too many communities, and unwilling to bend their necks to such a thralldom, or to discipline their powers to such uses, decide to serve God in other callings, sure that to this they are not called.

Two phenomena of our time, of serious aspect and growing proportions, claim attention before we dismiss our theme. They are in part an effect, in part a cause, of that waning prestige of the ministry of which we have been speaking. Both show themselves in different degrees of development. Both are complex phenomena. Both involve elements commanding respect—rights of ministers, and rights of congregations—with other elements whose existence, even in the slightest degree, threatens evil, and is evil. Both are complicated with factors supplied by the general condition of things in the world,—its rapid movement, its increased facilities for communication, its multiplied opportunities for comparisons and contrasts, its restlessness, its competitions, and other things involving disadvantage and peril, both to ministers and churches, in forms unknown to the staid and stationary days that were.

Let us look at the extremes. The ministry is represented as suffering at the hands of many Churches and congregations, not in sensibility and self-respect only, but in outward facilities and supports to a degree that limits its very ability to fulfil the office with which it has been divinely intrusted. Qualifications, of which no hint is given in the charter under which Church and ministry exist, are said to be imposed and forced into the foreground. Intelligence, piety, consecration, ripe experience, are lighter than air when compared with a fine person, a melodious voice, cultivated tastes, versatile talents, business capacity, power to draw money out of close pockets. Fastidiousness and caprice fasten upon these adventitious qualities in a degree quite disabling to many men who possess all the qualifications that the Word of God and the normal experience of the Church entitle any people, intent chiefly on spiritual blessings, to demand of the ministry. Pew-holders, and not Christ, are allowed to dictate the terms and the tenure of ministerial service; and the Church resolves itself into a shrewd business organisation, a fastidious audience, a corps of vigilant and jealous employers, wholly forgetful, it would seem, of the loving, living relations that should subsist between the Church and its ministry.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

On the other hand, Church and congregation complain that the chief concern of too many ministers seems to relate to the place where, and the conditions in which they will fulfil their Divine commission. They are fastidious; they are restless; they are intent upon large temporal conveniences in connection with the spiritual honours and rewards of their office. They gather in throngs at the doors of vacant churches that are eligible; they send specimen sermons, and resort to other strange devices to gain attention; they "settle" with ill-concealed mental reservations in regard to the length of their stay; they wait for something to turn up; they stand, hat in hand, ready on slight pretext, from within or from without, to depart to new adventures.

These extremes are too frequently and too vividly suggested by what actually occurs. Quiet ministries, full of mutual satisfaction, and rich in spiritual blessing, are much more rare than they were. Whether such evils shall be removed by wonders of grace or of spiritual judgment, like "a famine of hearing the words of the Lord," who can predict? The prestige and power of the ministry are as important, and should be as precious, to the Church, as to the ministry itself. Surely Church and ministry should present themselves before the Lord, and ask Him,—whose, in fact, this ministry is,—how it shall be fulfilled, how it shall be esteemed and sustained, if by it the body of Christ is to be edified and glorified.

CHARLES A. AIKEN.

---

## DR. CHALMERS.

THE 17th of March was the hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Chalmers. It was made the occasion, in Scotland, of much ardent commemoration and reminiscence. There used to be some measure of this even in Chalmers' own lifetime, at least among his students. These used to hold a public breakfast, and thereafter offer their formal congratulations to the Professor; the Irish students, of whom there were always many, wearing shamrock, inasmuch as Chalmers' birthday was also St. Patrick's day. But when the hundredth anniversary came round, it was felt that the time was come for the Scottish community to remember their countryman once more, and to recall to the younger generation, that has grown since he was taken away, the associations connected with his name.

The place in literature, especially in theological literature, which belongs to Chalmers, will be settled by the influence his works continue to exercise on the general mind, or, more adequately perhaps, by the rank which thinkers of various countries and schools assign to them. To the appreciation of that tribunal they may be safely left. His place in the history of our time must be gathered from the record of his life,

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

and from the results already developed, or still in course of being unfolded, from the movements in which he took part. It is not proposed, in this paper, to attempt an estimate on either ground, nor yet to survey the materials from which estimates of that kind might be made. Pre-supposing what might, with general concurrence, be said on both these topics, we would rather indicate some of the elements which gave him his peculiar place and power among his countrymen—in that Scottish community amid which he lived and worked. His hold upon the general world of English or of Evangelical thought was one thing ; his hold upon his own countrymen was another thing ; it was more complex, more powerful, and more subtle.

What gave Chalmers so strong a hold on Scotchmen, and such an influence among them, was, first of all, his personal greatness. No one in Scotland for many a long day left, like him, the impression on those around him, along so many lines, that in him they saw a truly great man. His intellectual and imaginative superiority was adequate to bear the weight of so high an estimation. That superiority was sure of recognition, because one of the forms in which it revealed itself was the most instantaneous and impressive of all—namely, that of the born orator. An orator he was in the strictest sense of the word, and he undoubtedly stood among the few in whom oratory rises to its highest power. He possessed the magical gift of the born speaker—to transfuse into his audience, by some magnetic virtue that plays round his words, but is distinct from them, the conviction and the passion that are thrilling in himself. With that power, a man makes every element of superiority that is in him self-evident to the dullest. But the superiority of Chalmers revealed itself not merely by efforts, or on great occasions, but without effort and on all occasions. Everything he said, in the commonest conversation, revealed a nature, fresh indeed and simple, but one that could not help setting its own stamp on every coin it issued. Then, added to the intellectual brightness, there was the impression of force or mass. You felt yourself in contact with a large nature. It grasped vigorously, it moved decisively, it took its impressions in a vivid, hearty way, and laid hold of objects with a strong efflux of affection and will. Again, there was the breadth of his humanity. Every chord was there, and thrilled readily ; every element was represented, broad and resonant, so that no valid human effort or aspiration failed to touch him. But, rising above all these, in influence and impression, was his moral greatness,—for the word greatness is not too strong. In benevolence, in sympathy with goodness, in veneration for all venerable things, in candour and humility, in all worthy efforts, in all noble vehemences and indignations, Chalmers reached a stature that can be expressed only by the word grandeur. Those who knew him can hardly ever read the text—“ Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report,—if there be any virtue, and if there

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

be any praise, think on these things"—without remembering Thomas Chalmers. He had his faults, of course. But, as usually happens with grand and true characters, the faults revealed the man, and the man could bear revealing. In particular cases you might hold his judgment to be in error, or you might hold his attitude to be faulty; but, through what you deemed his fault, you only saw with more assurance the invincible nobleness and the sterling metal.

It is not easy to convey an adequate notion of some of the qualities which contributed to this total or collective impression,—as, for instance, his humility, or his simplicity of nature. His humility was, as humility should be, quite unobtrusive. It was by no means always on the surface. But when it did become discernible, you perceived by the manner of its appearance that it had been there all through. It rested on a prompt appreciation of every apparent claim which others had on his respect, joined with uncommon sincerity in realising any need of instruction or lack of advantage on his own part. It was pleasant to him to feel that, in those he met, he had something to admire, or to look up to. But the difficulty is to bring out the utter genuineness and unaffectedness of all this. For it had not the least touch of "voluntary humility." He was conscious of his own intellectual force and vigour, and did not pretend to abjure the rank he held as a proved force among men. He was intense in his convictions, and his thoughts possessed him powerfully; therefore he was the very reverse of facile in yielding established convictions at any one's call. Every way he was free from the *niaiserie* of making others believe he was less than he was. And though he often overestimated other men, clothing them with virtues and attainments which came from his generosity and not from their desert, yet the overestimation was quite sincere while it lasted, and when his eyes were opened, the reaction was equally sincere. Hence his humility had a charming reality about it. For example, his reading was more that of a thoughtful religious man, interested in many topics of intellectual interest, than of a mere theologian, therefore in some theological directions it was limited; and the ease with which he recognised his limits, and the satisfaction and admiration with which he regarded any one who went beyond him, were delightful. In the same unconscious manner, his simplicity revealed itself. It had no touch of the simplicity of the simpleton. He was a shrewd, circumspect man, and had far too much fun and humour about him, too much perception of the ridiculous, to let him run any risk of that. Yet, though there was nothing of the simpleton, there was, on to his dying day, a very great deal of the child.

Coming from what he was to what he did, Chalmers was felt to be an eminently practical nature. He was a force moving towards results. One could see that his own gifts were valuable to himself mainly as they were serviceable towards worthy ends. Thus he was felt to be, as it were, a public institution, a common good. As to the objects he

aimed at, they were always connected with social and moral well-being. His conception of well-being was regulated ultimately by the Gospel ; but still it shaped itself in a broad, human, experimental way ; it neither omitted nor underrated the less ethereal elements, while it reached forward to the peculiar fruits and effects of redemption. Thus conceived, the ends he sought never presented themselves to him vaguely, but as definite things to be resolutely achieved and accomplished by appropriate means. His conceptions of parochial and congregational economy, of the poor-laws, of church extension, among many others, bear this stamp. And in them all, four things were found in him that were characteristic. One was his enthusiasm for his object, whatever it was. He fell in love with it, and burned with ardour for its accomplishment. Another was his practical weight and force. There are enthusiasts who can never make affairs move ;—there are even wise and thoughtful men who can never translate their thoughts into the form of force. But Chalmers among his fellows was dynamic. Another was his disposition to bring theory into the service of his practical operations. Practical he was ; but it was his delight to base his line of operations upon a principle or a set of principles. Some quality of the human nature to be dealt with,—some condition of the problem to be solved,—was laid hold of ; it was vividly illustrated, so that men became conscious of its significance. Then it became the rationale of a plan of operations. Such, to name an instance, was his distinction between the aggressive and the attractive principle in home mission-work. The principle, whatever it might be, was expounded and celebrated as solicitously as if Chalmers had been a mere theorist. It was philosophised ; its connection was shown, in all directions, with unexpected facts and principles ; it became a discovery to be delighted in intellectually, to be glorified oratorically ; but it had to pay for its honours, for the worth of it was to come out by its proving to be workable. A wonderful charm, and even poetry, was thrown in this way round all the efforts which Dr. Chalmers set in motion and led on. Nay, every votary and co-operator felt himself elevated and glorified by the radiance of principle and of eloquence thrown round the operations. Each could feel himself (at second hand) a highly intellectual and philosophic person, working on the most select and penetrating principles, and on lines of operation that could be celebrated and proclaimed with the confidence of conviction and with the ardour of enthusiasm. And so, even if at first the general world was unsympathetic or unbelieving, there were always crowds of elastic minds that rallied to him enthusiastically ; ere long, the stream flowed strong and carried all with it. Once more as to this ; as Chalmers was in full sympathy with everything human, and all his objects and efforts were characteristically humane, so more specially all his operations breathed the spirit of trust in his countrymen, as those who should stand by him in work and sacrifice. All along he seemed sure of this, that they would be with him in any good cause. His way of putting things



CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

implied that he had no doubt they were as staunch and ardent as himself. All his operations were planned under the conviction that the Scottish people could be reckoned on to work up to the pitch of his own doing and aspirations. And that was his real feeling. In the best sense, he judged of others by himself. If he was devoted and determined when he saw his way, others would be so if he would show them the way. This was a faith which subjected him to disappointments, but in a far larger degree it fulfilled itself and bore fruits. It sustained in many minds an enthusiastic and grateful adherence that would have died rather than disappoint him. It woke the best qualities of men and women to feel how simply and sincerely he counted on them as up to the level of his own best qualities. This was no pretence on his part, it was instinctive; and it is perhaps one of the best tributes to the Scottish character which late years have furnished, that Chalmers, rating his countrymen so high, found his confidence so highly repaid. A reminiscence of a speaker at the Edinburgh meeting is in point. Shortly before the Disruption, Lord Moncreiff, speaking to Dr. Chalmers of the prospects then in view, said to him, "Well, I suppose it must be. But surely you cannot think that, in our poor country, a Church of a thousand parishes can be sustained by voluntary contributions?" The answer was, "Sir, you do not know the power of conviction in the minds of the staple of the Scottish population." The Scottish people felt that his whole life was a life of expectant trust in them. How could they fail to trust him?

The mental and moral qualities of Chalmers were sustained and potentiated by his faith. This became for him the centre of life, the standard of worth, the source of inspiration. This furnished him, too, with his leading aim; it gave unity and elevation to the efforts of his life. Now, this great element certainly became a source of peculiar power among his own people. In virtue of it, he found himself in fellowship with the soundest part of his countrymen, with their traditions, their convictions, their aspirations. And yet this part of his power had a peculiarity about it that deserves to be noted. For Chalmers, without the least ambition of being a reformer or revolutionist in theology—satisfied with the great known elements of the Reformed Confessions—still conceived his theology with characteristic freshness. Everything that he received he made his own before he issued it again. And if the theology he uttered was unchanged, the accent of the utterance was laid in a new manner, at once vivifying and simplifying. With many a Scottish preacher, the Gospel had been presented as a solemn and sublime equation—a grand order of stable certainties rising steadfast before the soul, doubtless with a warm "practical application" appended. With Chalmers, all seemed to come into flow, and to stream towards practice and results. And so, instead of standing in the background of the busy modern life, as something to be recognised indeed, and protected, but with difficulty protected against the wearing influence of the currents of the time, the Gospel came to

the front as containing the only possible solution of the most pressing problems, it came out to be worked for that end with the most confident enthusiasm. In saying this, it is not forgotten how many men before Chalmers, and with him, wrought in the same sense; for what is now referred to was virtually present in the whole Evangelical revival. Yet no one in Scotland conceived and exemplified it like Chalmers. And in doing so, in addition to all the hearts he was honoured to win for the Gospel, he conferred extrication and enlargement on multitudes who loved it before, adding confidence to their faith, enabling them to realise in their lives a fuller harmony and a richer and more joyful meaning.

And if it was so in the practical relations of the faith, it was so, too, in the intellectual. With a child-like confidence in the Bible, the most simple and thorough, Chalmers had a fine perception of the perspective of truth, of the more and the less primary, the more essential and the more subsidiary. On the other side, he felt a genuine delight in science, and cherished a truly philosophic loyalty to facts; which, as John Stuart Mill once said, "he always had the merit of studying at first hand." In this department, too, he distinguished, in his sagacious way, what was fairly made out from what was merely speculative, and summed up the result in principles. The result was a cordial adjustment of two interests, which smaller men are apt to set against one another. Bible truth and scientific truth he loved to welcome together. He made timely room for both, without waiting till stress of weather compelled him. For this, the religious community owed him much, and gradually learned to recognise its obligations. He at least was one whose Evangelical convictions were above suspicion. So the example of his large and wise handling of truth tranquillised men's minds and widened them. Nor was it only in the border-land between the Bible and science that this influence was felt. It pervaded the whole domain of Bible doctrine as a genial instinct for discerning and minding the main things. The danger is always present—it was, no doubt, present in Scotland then—that men should declare their value for Evangelical truth by shutting themselves up in an anxious, suspicious, disputatious temper. Many men who learned to bring out the truth they loved into genial sunlight, and summer air, and unembarrassed companionship with the growing studies of the time, felt that they owed much of that benefit to Chalmers.

And, indeed (to add one more remark), this was but an instance—certainly the most important—of the relation in which Chalmers stood to Scottish traditions. The influence a man shall exert on a nation must depend, not merely on the measure of his power, but on the relation in which he stands to the ideas which, as the result of all the past, possess and rule the general mind. Scotland is strong in traditions; in her religious and her ecclesiastical life emphatically, she nurses, with affectionate solicitude, the regard for all good things of days gone by. And Chalmers was predisposed to venerate all venerable things. But he had a strong and vivid hold of the present. He realised its conditions and

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

its wants as the serious concern of life. He was, indeed, carrying on his own education in the study of it to his closing day. Such a man could never be the servant of traditions. Therefore, while he loved the past, he used it as a master. He instinctively laid hold of what was true, serviceable, durable, in those ancient examples and rules. Never out of sympathy with the memories and the genius of Scottish tradition, he was yet felt and seen to be carrying on the history of Scottish Church life in a magnanimous and unfettered way. He thus did much to teach us a nobler loyalty to our Church's history than that which worships its forms and its details. It may be permitted to a member of the Free Church to point out how emphatic a testimony to the value of her principles is derived from the adherence of such a man—so careless of ecclesiastical technicalities, so solicitous for great and permanent Christian interests.

The writer may recall, in conclusion, a conversation with the late Dr. Fairbairn of Newhaven, a man as select and fresh in mind as he was admirable and lovable in character. He spoke of his younger days, when, in successive sessions, he used to journey to college from his home in the south-east of Scotland. He told how he went in company with youths he named, and what they talked of. Several of them had some seeds of piety in their hearts, and looked towards the ministry. Parish after parish, as they went along, presented to them specimens of Moderate ministers—men who, in that district at any rate, were too commonly cold, and secular, and careless. That was not what he or his companions desired to be. To young Fairbairn, it seemed neither a safe nor a happy thing to be a minister in such fellowship, and in the atmosphere there created. He often thought of becoming a minister in the Secession, for among that body there were life and fervour, both in the pulpit and in the pew. They were, in their way of preaching, old-fashioned,—in some of their notions narrow; their whole position implied undesirable limitations. Yet if the main thing, the life and the truth, existed among them, was not that worth all else? It was when these thoughts were becoming very strong in him that he became aware of the power with which a witness for the Gospel was being set forth in some pulpits of the Establishment. And what struck him was, that it was a new style of thought and preaching. It forsook the old-fashioned methods of speech and forms of thought. It spoke out to the age as it was. And yet it was not less evangelical than the preaching which commanded his earlier reverence. If not more evangelical, it yet had in it the promise and potency of a far more vivid and arresting message to the men and women whom it was desirable to reach. It was this that reversed the current of his thoughts, and fixed him and others in the Church of Chalmers. Very soon, indeed, the Secession, too, had its own fresh and original minds, performing the service of their generation. But, meanwhile, Fairbairn and his friends had felt the way opened to them into the true conception of the work of their lives. Chalmers was not the first who did something in this

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

line. Andrew Thomson came before him. But Chalmers was the greatest, and performed far the widest service. By himself, and by those he formed and influenced, he widened, sweetened, elevated, and harmonised the Christian thinking of the flower of the Scottish Christian people. And he did so while he was animating every believing man and woman to labour in the most simple and direct way for the conversion and salvation of the lapsed masses.

These were, at any rate, among the elements of the power by which Chalmers moved his countrymen. He felt his kinship with them—but he claimed them on their nobler side, taking them through their higher possibilities. They felt their kinship with him, but they felt that, standing higher, he lifted them; more advanced than they, he drew them on. With finer instincts, he taught them what to hold more firmly, and what to maintain with less tenacity. The higher rank of mind in Chalmers was accompanied by a thousand ties of fellowship, of recognition, that bound him to his humblest countrymen. Hence he belonged to them, and they belonged to him.

ROBERT RAINY.

## CHRIST AND PETER AT THE SEA OF TIBERIAS.

HE stood once more upon the beach,  
The waves' low murmur filled his ear,  
Soft rippling up the sandy reach—  
The sound he loved of old to hear.

And, dearer than earth's sweetest strain,  
One voice of well-remembered tone—  
His heart's lost music—breathed again,  
Awakening chords before unknown.

Not many days had dawned and died,  
Since last he trod that sacred shore;  
Yet had they swept him far and wide  
From all the days that went before.

One lurid morn in memory burned—  
One scene perturbed of hurrying ill—  
Where to the coal-fed fire he turned  
To chase away the grief-struck chill;

One question that he could not flee,  
Thrice asked, thrice answered, ne'er forgot,  
"Thou wast with him of Galilee?"  
"I swear to thee, I know him not;"

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

One Form of awful majesty  
 That stood out from the background dim,  
 And with divinely searching eye,  
 Severe, yet tender, looked on him.

Now, as a child might raptured wake  
 From dream of fear to sudden bliss,  
 And see the summer morning break  
 And meet his mother's soothing kiss ;—

So beamed the sad disciple's brow  
 While calm the risen Saviour smiled ;  
 His spirit drank that radiant glow—  
 The sunshine of the reconciled.

Love linked anew its broken chain,  
 The joy returned from moments fled ;  
 Faith's scattered pearls were found again,  
 And strung upon their golden thread.

They sat by the mysterious fire—  
 Beside the wonder-furnished board ;  
 And wherefore should the lips inquire,  
 When the heart whispered, " 'Tis the Lord " ?

What spoken word shall break at last  
 The silent spell so sacred grown—  
 Rouse secret echoes of the past,  
 That answer to no other tone ?

" Simon Barjona, lov'st thou Me ?  
 And dost thou love Me more than these ?"  
 " Yea, Lord, Thou know'st my love to Thee !  
 Thine eye my inmost being sees."

" Then feed My lambs, My feeble ones,\*  
 And pasture them with tenderest care ;  
 To him who want and weakness owns,  
 I give My chosen task to share."

" Simon Barjona, lov'st thou me ?"  
 A second time the Saviour said ;  
 " Yea, Lord, Thou know'st my love to Thee !  
 No thought have I Thou hast not read."

" Then feed my precious purchased sheep,  
 And shepherd them with pastoral hand ;  
 I give to thee a charge to keep  
 On My behalf, at My command."

\* Alford, in accordance with his reading of the Greek text, marks the distinction of lambs, full-grown sheep, and young sheep that may be supposed more apt to wander.



Thrice o'er that question ! "Lov'st thou Me  
 With love that friend for friend may prove ?"  
 "Lord, Thou this throbbing heart canst see,  
 And, knowing all things, know'st I love !"  
 "Then feed My sheep—my young fair flock,  
 Heedless of harm, and apt to stray ;  
 Back to the shelter of the Rock,  
 Thy steps shall mark the homeward way."  
 Ah ! then the grieved Apostle guessed  
 The gracious meaning of his Lord !  
 The Thrice-denied was thrice confessed,  
 And the thrice-fallen, thrice restored.  
 Yet bears his brow a shadow still,  
 Like cloud returning after rain ;  
 "This feeble faith—this wavering will—  
 If what has been should be again ?"  
 "Nay, Peter ! once self-girt and bold,  
 Forward to choose thy way and lot,  
 Thou shalt be girt when thou art old,  
 And carried where thou wouldest not.  
 "Through all the course that lies between,  
 Still let it seem enough for thee  
 To set thy feet where Mine have been,  
 To take thy cross and follow Me."

A. R. COUSIN.

## THE REFORMED CHURCH IN FRANCE FROM 1802 TO 1872.

THE history of the Reformed Church in France during the present century may, in no arbitrary way, be divided into three epochs. The first begins with 1802, when Bonaparte, by his "Concordat," established the connection which in the future was to exist between the Romish and Protestant Churches and the State. It ends with the reign of Louis Philippe. During this period, Protestantism, ecclesiastically speaking, remains in the *statu quo*, but with regard to religious life, it is an era of the highest importance. For then were sown, by the apostles of the Revival, the seeds of that living piety which had almost disappeared under the latitudinarian influence of Rousseau's school.

The second period begins with 1848. It is inaugurated by a meeting of the chief representatives of the Churches, and closes with the down-

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

fall of the Second Empire. The principal events of these twenty years are, the promulgation of the new State-laws concerning the Protestant Church, and the development of the controversies between the evangelical and rationalistic parties.

The third and present period, which commences with the opening of the General Synod (1872), has been fully described in this review by the Rev. C. Babut, of Nîmes.\* Our object is merely to set forth the ecclesiastical and theological evolution during the two first of these epochs. It must be added that we are chiefly indebted for the elements of this sketch to the valuable works of the lamented Professors de Félice and Bonifas, and to the "*Histoire du XXX. Synode de l'Eglise Réformée*," by the Rev. E. Bersier, of Paris.

## I.

When Bonaparte undertook the reconstitution, on a new basis, of the Reformed Church, he found before him the descendants of those Huguenots who had been unable to seek a refuge in foreign countries. The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, in 1685, was followed, it will be remembered, by the heroic period of the Désert. In many respects, this phase may be considered as exhibiting the power of endurance and vitality of French Protestantism in a grander way than the preceding one. Then, it is true, the Huguenots suffered much, but they represented a political as well as a religious party. They treated with royalty, often on equal terms; their chiefs belonged to the highest nobility of the land, and princes of the blood-royal were among their adherents. When the iniquitous Revocation deprived them of the comparative toleration which they had enjoyed since the time of Henri IV.; when Louis XIV., after closing the last National Synod, decreed that no religion should be recognised in his kingdom save that of Madame de Maintenon; then began the long and wearying struggle between right and might, between religious fanaticism and the faith of those who worshipped in spirit and in truth. The moral strength of the French Reformation was then put to a very severe test. The wealthy, the noble, the intelligent among the Protestants succeeded in reaching the frontier; and only a few scattered peasants remained in the plains of Languedoc, the mountains of the Cévennes, Central France, Poitou, and Normandy, as representatives of the faith of Calvin, Coligny, and Condé. During one hundred years, these peasants, by their individual energy and faith, kept burning the light of Scriptural truth; and the sword of the dragonnades, and the abduction of their children, were alike powerless to overcome their patient heroism. The only historical parallel is that of the Covenanters; but it must be remembered that, with the Huguenots, the ordeal lasted for more than a century. One of the most striking features of this period was the fidelity with which the Huguenots adhered to their form of Church-government. To this must, in a great measure, be attributed the non-

\* See *Catholic Presbyterian* for September, 1879.

extinction of the evangelical faith in France. However scattered the members of the small flock might be, they firmly maintained that strong Presbyterian organisation which the genius of Calvin had bequeathed to their Church.

One man, Antoine Court, was, so to speak, the incarnation of this Presbyterian spirit. Feeling that the want of connection between the Churches was a greater peril than priestly persecution, he undertook and accomplished the gigantic work of reconstituting the Synodal system. Through his endeavours, delegates from nearly all the suffering Churches met in the fastnesses of the Vivarais, and formed the first "Synode National du Désert." Eight times did this great assembly meet between 1726 and 1763; and numerous Provincial Synods consolidated and carried on, throughout the land, the resolutions voted or recommended by this supreme ecclesiastical body. These Synods insisted on the strict application of the old "Discipline des Eglises Reformées," and upheld the spirit of fidelity to the "Confession de Foi de la Rochelle." Imprisonment, the galleys, death in its most hideous forms, were for these humble peasants the unfailing results of their steadfast faith. Hardly a century has elapsed since the last martyrs of the Reformed faith, Pasteur Rochette, and three young country gentlemen, the brothers De Grenier, suffered death at Toulouse.

The age of intolerance was, however, passing away, and the premonitory symptoms of the Great Revolution were already appearing in the sceptical court of Louis XV. Toleration towards the heretics was preached by the "Patriarche de Ferney," while the vague sentimentalism of Rousseau's school introduced into the polite world a decided tendency towards general philanthropy. Though Protestants had as yet no legal existence, they were at liberty to engage in commerce, to cultivate the soil, and even to assemble for worship within a short distance of towns, without incurring the penalties imposed by the Draconian laws of the kingdom. The edict of toleration which, in 1787, was granted by Louis XVI., was the mere recognition by the State of the tolerant spirit which had prevailed for the previous twenty years.

Truth, however, compels us to state that this period of comparative calm was more dangerous to French Presbyterianism than the era of cruel persecution had been. The spiritual descendants of Calvin felt the blighting influence of the sceptical and sensualistic schools of thought, whose chiefs were Voltaire, Diderot, and the Encyclopedists. As the practice of the Synodal system became more easy, attachment to it gradually weakened; and we can trace to this deplorable spirit of religious laxity (at that time only too prevalent in Europe) many of our present difficulties. Thus only can we explain the acceptance, by the sons of the "Pasteurs du Désert," of the organisation of the Protestant Church which was carried out by Napoleon under the name of the Concordat.

The beginning of this century was, for France, a period of social renovation, as well as of military triumph. The despotic genius of

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

Napoleon was felt, not only on the battlefields of Germany, but also in all the various forms of the national life. It was under his auspices that a new code of civil and penal laws was enacted, and that the semi-military organisation of the "Université de France" was reared on the ruins of the old Sorbonne. The relationship between Church and State was too important a question not to attract the utmost attention of a mind such as that of Napoleon. The collection of laws which were framed to rule and guide this relationship is called the Concordat. We have not here to examine these in their bearings on Roman Catholicism. Let it merely be observed that, inasmuch as Popery wielded an immense social influence in the country, and was a powerful and most useful auxiliary to stem the tide of revolutionary ideas, Bonaparte had neither the will nor the power to injure its ecclesiastical system. It was otherwise, however, with regard to Protestantism. Its social power was a thing of the future, and its representatives, after the long era of persecution which many of them well remembered, were only too glad to accept certain State privileges and prerogatives, which seemed to confer not only toleration, but complete religious equality. The prestige of an all-absorbing personality, and the flattering self-consciousness of ranking at the coronation immediately after French cardinals, weakened the feeling of fidelity to the severe but admirable system which had triumphantly survived the great wars of the sixteenth, the persecutions of the seventeenth, and the "Désert" of the eighteenth centuries. On the other hand, the strong spirit of self-government inherent in Presbyterianism was naturally distasteful to the hero of Brumaire, who held, as firmly as ever a Bourbon could have done, the well-known maxim, "L'état, c'est moi." From the weakness of the representative Protestants, and the grasping despotism of Napoleon, resulted the law of the "18 germinal an X" (7th April, 1802).

It is hardly possible to exaggerate the baneful influence which that enactment has exercised on French Protestantism. The Reformed Church thereby lost two of its eminently Presbyterian characteristics,—the primary unit—viz., the local "Kirk-session," and its supreme governing body, the General Assembly, or "Synode National"—its hand and its head. As a substitute for this organisation, where liberty and authority are so admirably combined, the law of Germinal instituted a certain number of "Eglises consistoriales," formed by groups of 6000 souls each. The local parishes thus lost their individual autonomy, without gaining in return that corporate strength which agglomeration produces. The manner in which these "consistorial boards" were nominated revealed a still greater contempt for the ancient usage of the Huguenot Church; for the power of electing the lay members of the consistoire was limited to a small number of citizens whose rating stood the highest. Against this senseless *régime*, the Reformed Church was destined to struggle during the first half of the present century.

Let us now turn to the internal history of the Church as thus organised,—or rather, disorganised,—and study the gradual evolution

by which the synodal system was to regain its hold on the Protestant mind. The development of theological thought at once claims our attention. The old standards of the faith, though regarded as rather obsolete, were still respected. Supernatural Christianity was uniformly professed, and no germs of disagreement were, as yet, apparent among the leading intellects of the Protestant community. But when the Restoration gave peace to the country at large, there appeared two currents which, in process of time, were to flow further and further apart, as new influences made themselves felt among religious thinkers.

Two eminent men then represented the two opposite tendencies. The first was Samuel Vincent, pastor of the important Church of Nîmes, a preacher and writer of considerable power and learning. That he adhered to the grand doctrines of Christianity remains undoubted. Yet a careful perusal of his works will show that the subjective theory of Schleiermacher and Benjamin Constant, which places the basis of religion in the innate feeling of the human soul, had taken a great hold of his mind. The second leader was Daniel Encontre. Born at Nîmes in 1762, the son of a "Pasteur du Désert," his fervent piety led him at first to follow his father in his work of evangelisation, until compelled by ill-health to desist. His unique intellectual gifts procured him at first a high place in the scientific world. He was Dean of the Faculty of Sciences at Montpellier, when the unanimous vote of his co-religionists called him to the Theological College at Montauban, as Professor and Dean. The affirmative character of his teaching (a strong contrast to the dead-alive system then prevalent), blended with his attractive piety, have left their mark on a whole generation of pastors.

The Revival was now to bring to light the diverging tendencies which had hitherto remained latent in the Church. The great wave of religious revival, which, at the beginning of this century, had passed over Great Britain and Switzerland, at length reached France; and it is not without emotion that French Protestants of the present day remember the revered names of Cook and the brothers Haldane. To their apostolic zeal is partly due the formation of the great religious societies. The Bible Society was founded in 1819, the Religious Tract Society in 1821, the Missionary Society in 1822. Attention was also given to the evangelisation of scattered Protestants; and the labours of Felix Neff among the mountaineers of the Hautes Alpes remain a proof of the marvellous success sometimes granted to fervent, single-hearted zeal. We purposely insist on the constitution of these religious societies; for they were not only symptoms of the revival of true piety, but also proved most effective agencies in promoting the spirit of unity and self-government among the churches.

This growth of religious earnestness and life was accompanied, in a corresponding degree, by a stronger affirmation of the vital dogmas of the faith. Preachers, instead of entertaining their hearers with well-written essays on moral subjects, now appealed to their individual con-



CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

sciences. The fall of man, the love of God, the necessity for conversion, were their prevailing topics. Thus, the divergence between those for whom Christianity was but an admirable system of ethics, and those to whom belief in Christ as the living Saviour was the one object of faith, became clear and distinct; and an event soon took place which marked this important difference. The Church of Lyons then had, as one of its pastors, a young man to whose ardent love for souls, and deep personal piety, was added the gift of an incomparable eloquence, and who was destined to become, under God, the means of salvation for many. His name was Adolphe Monod. The practice of admitting all persons to the Holy Communion, without examination or restriction, was one to which he was strongly opposed, on conscientious grounds; and, in a sermon on the subject, he set forth his views in language of unequalled power. This was resented by many, to whom such a theory appeared to curtail, in an inquisitorial manner, their liberty as Protestants. A petition was placed in the hands of the consistoire (whose leaning towards latitudinarianism was well known) to obtain the resignation of M. Monod. The young pastor was accused of having attacked "the most admirable, the most difficult, the most holy of all religions, that of good works dictated by the conscience, and thus to have wounded the human reason, that emanation from the Deity." M. Monod, considering that the doctrine he had preached was inherent in the spirit of Christianity, and in accordance with the Huguenot discipline, refused to resign. He was, nevertheless, dismissed by the consistoire, and the sentence was confirmed by Government. This event soon assumed an importance no longer local, but general; and the clergy and consistoires, according to their doctrinal proclivities, approved or condemned the dismissal. M. Monod soon afterwards received a call from the church in Paris, where he continued his work of faith and love, inspiring with something of his own spirit the humblest Protestants, as well as those of high social standing, and leaving behind him, when called to his rest, a nucleus of earnest Christian workers. Years, seemingly uneventful, rolled by; but, in reality, the chasm grew wider and wider between those, on the one hand, for whom the sin of man was a terrible and tragic fact, and salvation a sublime miracle of God's love, and those, on the other, who looked upon Christianity as merely (to use the language of the Lyons petitioners), "*La religion des bonnes œuvres inspirées par la conscience.*"

## II.

The Revolution of 1848 brought before the public mind the question of the separation of Church and State. This idea, though new and strange to the country at large, was not new to Protestant minds. Vinet, one of the deepest religious thinkers of modern times, had popularised the notion, and was among the most active founders of the "Free Church" in French Switzerland. The Reformed Church, in the

midst of the chaos produced by the Revolution which had sent Louis Philippe into exile, felt that self-reliance and combination were necessary in view of coming events. Ninety delegates from the consistoires met at Paris. To this assembly there has been applied the name of "Synode Officieux,"\* though its proceedings were sanctioned neither by Church nor State. A minority demanded that a Confession should be drawn up, to counteract the rationalistic ideas which, from time to time, manifested themselves within her borders. This measure was not carried, not from any dogmatic reason, but because the majority deemed it inopportune to create an agitation on this subject among the Churches. Two of the most influential members of the minority, M. Frédéric Monod and the Comte de Gasparin, persisted in their demand, seceded from the Established Church, and formed the "Eglise Libre," or Free Church. They were the founders of the "Union of Evangelical Churches of France," which now numbers about forty-eight congregations, and whose theologians and pastors stand pre-eminent among French Protestants. We may here mention the well-known names of Dr. de Pressensé and Dr. Fisch. The "Synode Officieux" drew up a plan of Church reorganisation, which, though lacking official sanction, nevertheless rendered effective service, by presenting, in opposition to the law of Germinal, a constitution of the true Presbyterian type—i.e., the Kirk-session, the Provincial Synod, and the General Assembly, as the governing bodies of the Church. Later events proved that this was a step in the right direction. In 1852, Louis Napoleon, the Prince President of the Republic, in quest of popularity, modified, by a series of decrees, the law of Germinal. These decrees reconstituted the parochial unit, under the name of "conseil presbytéral;" and, in grouping together, according to geographical affinity, a certain number of these, under the name of "consistoires," gave to the Churches a degree of cohesion unknown since the time of the old Provincial Synods. The decrees of 1852, however, only substituted, for the former electoral system, one equally dangerous. The first Bonaparte had decided that the members of ecclesiastical boards should be nominated by the highest-rated citizens; the third Napoleon accorded the right of voting to all persons who, by birth and marriage, were of Protestant extraction, without any conditions of adhesion to the faith of the Church. In this way, universal suffrage was introduced. It is unnecessary to insist on the dangers and evils of such a system. Moreover, instead of restoring the General Assembly as the governing body of the Church, Napoleon III. constituted a "Conseil Central," composed of men selected by the Government, whose functions were to advise the Minister of Public Worship on matters appertaining to the Reformed Church.

An incident will show the theory held by some of the latitudinarian party concerning the autonomy of the Church. The Pasteur Athanase Coquerel, senior, propounded a scheme of Church discipline, accord-

\* Regarding this designation, see *Catholic Presbyterian* for February, 1880, p. 148.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

ing to which the supreme direction of Church affairs was to be vested in a council of thirty-one members. Of these, ten were to be clergymen chosen by the Government; the twenty lay members were likewise to be selected from a list of 105 names, presented by the 105 "consistoires." It was hardly possible to show greater contempt for the great principle of the Church's right of self-government. Henceforth, the dogmatic and ecclesiastical differences between the two opposite parties in the Reformed Churches became more and more marked; and, from the promulgation of the decrees of 1852 to the assembling of the National Synod in 1872, the history of the Reformed Church is one of growing negations on the one hand, and more strenuous affirmation of positive Christian truth on the other. The Right, or Evangelical party, every year steadily affirms the necessity of more fully confessing the faith of their fathers, and of strengthening the Church organisation in a truly Presbyterian form; the Left, or so-called "Liberal" party, tends more and more towards considering faith as a purely subjective feeling, leaving more and more scope within the Church to the negative criticism of the Tübingen school; while, in the sphere of ecclesiastical action, the tendency of this party is to deny all necessity of a personal adherence to the doctrines of Reformed Christianity, such as justification by faith, &c.

Several symptoms indicate this progress. It will be remembered that the theology of Samuel Vincent frankly admitted the supernatural agency of God in the Person of Jesus Christ. A new theological organ of the Left made its appearance, the *Revue de Strasbourg*, edited by Messrs. Scherer and Colani, two of the most talented men in the Strasbourg University. By degrees this review became, in France, the organ of the ultra-negative criticism of Strauss and Baur; and when, in 1863, Renan published his celebrated "*Vie de Jésus*," it was received with marked favour by the men of this party. Several works by the leading Rationalists confirmed these views; and, in 1864, M. Pécaut wrote a book, the conclusion of which was as follows:—"We belong to another Church than even the most moderate among the orthodox Christians. Between these two equally respectable tendencies, an understanding is impossible within the boundaries of the same Church." This was truly the "mot de la situation."

Later events showed that no reconciliation was possible between the Right and the Left. Pasteur Martin Paschoud, of Paris, one of the surviving representatives of Samuel Vincent's school, had, as his assistant, the Rev. Athanase Coquerel, the younger, a member of the rationalistic party. His term of service having expired, both the kirk-session (conseil presbytéral) and the consistoire refused, on dogmatic grounds, to renew his license. Just as, many years before, the Lyons incident had become a question of general interest, so in 1864, this measure was vigorously discussed by the partisans on both sides. The Left brought forward the old plea, that doctrinal stringency is incompatible with Protestant liberty. The Evangelicals answered, that

a Church cannot be an arena for unlimited freedom of discussion, but a body with an historical faith and well-defined dogmas. In their eyes, the high character and talents of M. Coquerel were above suspicion. But they could not confide the pastorate of a church to one who, however eminent, had declared his wide divergence from the traditional faith on its most cardinal points, and had repeatedly bestowed the greatest praise on the manifestly antichristian work of M. Renan. This was a burning question, and the parties were soon to measure their strength on a new field.

For some years previously, among the clergy and laity, both in Paris and the South, there had been established "pastoral conferences," at which questions of interest were considered, and reports read on various contemporary matters. Let it be remarked that these conferences, though devoid of the prestige and authority of synods, have been of real service in producing and fostering a spirit of union among the scattered clergy, and in bringing out the prevailing opinion of the Church on the most important topics. The Paris Conferences of 1864 were of special interest; for the evangelical party, by a majority of 141 against 23, passed a resolution professing unswerving attachment to the traditional faith of the Church, affirming also the right and duty of ecclesiastical bodies to enforce this faith as binding upon all their ministers. That same year, the *Conférence du Gard* assembled at Nîmes. Till then, the members of the Right and Left had sat and discussed together all questions of general interest. The Rev. Jean Monod having proposed a formula of adherence to the Creed, it was strenuously opposed by the "Liberal" party. The result was a division between the Right and Left, and the foundation, by the southern Evangelicals, of a new conference, which met at Alais. A hundred and seventy pastors and lay delegates from the churches of the south were present, and the confession of faith agreed upon some months before at Paris was there carried with acclamation. Those present at this conference will never forget the impressive scene; the whole assembly rose to its feet and gave utterance to its feelings of joy and gratitude in the popular hymn—

"Gloire à Jésus Christ mon Sauveur  
Car en lui seul j'espère.  
Heureux celui qui dans son cœur  
L'adore et le révère!"

The moment was indeed a solemn one, for now the old Reformed Church felt its strength, and found new power in this confession of their common faith, made by northern and southern Protestants.

Year by year, until the great war, each party met in its separate camp, and passed resolutions which carried them farther and farther apart. On one occasion, the pseudo-liberals declared "that faith in the supernatural agency of God in the universe is in no wise necessary to

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

the development of religious life;" while, at a meeting of the Evangelicals held a few months later, the conclusion of a report by Professor Bois, on the reality of Christian supernaturalism, was unanimously accepted. We must also note the decision taken at another large meeting, that of Valence, in virtue of which, the power of voting at church-elections was to be limited to those who professed their loyalty "to the constitutional principles of the Reformed Church"—*i.e.*, "the Word of God as the only rule of faith, and the Apostles' Creed, as a symbol of its Divine revelations." The stir among the Churches, produced by these successive meetings, had the effect of showing plainly that a General Assembly, or National Synod, was absolutely necessary. Both the Government and Parliament were repeatedly petitioned on this question, and there is no doubt that the end would have been attained, had not the war of 1870-71, and the Revolution which followed, brought about the collapse of the Second Empire.

The Government of the Republic, presided over by M. Thiers, restored to the Reformed Church its Synod, or General Assembly. In M. Babut's article, our English-speaking friends have a most complete account of the efforts made by French Protestants to carry out the synodal system, and the difficulties they have encountered. In our present retrospective sketch, it will be seen that the contentions in the Reformed Church are distinctly traceable to two causes; first, as regards doctrine, the influence of eighteenth-century rationalism, which was never quite extinct even during the revival, and received a fresh impulse from the Tübingen school; secondly, as regards Church polity, the lack of a truly Presbyterian organisation, to secure respect for the traditional faith of the Church.

It may be said that the remedy for this state of things is already being applied; and it will remain to the lasting honour of the Evangelicals that they have toiled bravely, often against wind and tide, for the re-establishment of those great ecclesiastical principles, which, put in exercise through the energy of Antoine Court at the commencement of the seventeenth century, saved the Reformed Church from impending destruction.

It is increasingly felt that the true solution of ecclesiastical difficulties is found in active Christian work among the masses of unevangelised Protestants. Rationalism, by its growing spirit of negation, and its ultra-individualistic tendency, is working itself steadily out of the Church. The future, under God's blessing, will belong to the hardest and most faithful workers in the wide field of home missionary labour, whether among the momentarily estranged children of the Reformed Church, or those multitudes of so-called Romanists who are yearning for Gospel light.

H. J. WHEATCROFT.



## EARLY TIMES IN CHALDEA.

THE tenth chapter of Genesis occupies a unique position among the primitive records of our race. Almost every nation has some kind of tradition of its own origin and early history, yielding, in the midst of what is merely legendary, fragments of fact regarding early migrations and prehistoric connections with other races. This chapter, however, professes not merely to trace the descent of the Hebrew nation, but to explain the genealogies and affinities of all the neighbouring tribes. The author seems so full of the wondrous deliverance he has just narrated, that he cannot but take his stand, as it were, on some loftier Pisgah, and, scanning the countries that stretch to the horizon on every side, show how their inhabitants all stand related to the few who were saved from the waters of the flood. He tells us that the distinctions he draws between them are of four kinds. They are differences of descent, "after their families;" differences of language, "after their tongues;" differences of geographical position, "after their lands;" differences of political history, "after their nations." Of course, the complete proof of the historical accuracy of such a document would require a correct identification of all the tribes referred to, and information from independent sources as to all those circumstances connected with them. And unless this record should belong to a period very much more ancient than the monumental inscriptions, we should naturally look to them for some light upon the subject. In point of fact, something has been gained from the monuments in the way of identifying the names and geographical position of some of the tribes at a period much earlier than is reached by any of the notices concerning them in classical writers. In the Assyrian inscriptions, we find the names of several of the "sons of Japheth" occupying positions to the north and north-west of Assyria. Many of the Cushite and Joktanite tribes of Arabia can also be distinguished. The Egyptian inscriptions have explained some of the obscure names of the "sons of Mizraim." Lenormant (*Manual*, i. 202) connects *Ludim* with the Egyptian word *Lut*, or *Rut*—"that is, 'men' *par excellence*," the dominant race of the primitive Egyptian dynasties, "a small military caste to whom the people quietly submitted." The *Pathrusim* are the men of *Patoris*, Southern or Upper Egypt. *Caphtorim* has probably to do with *Keft* or *Keftu*, a name of some part of the coast district towards the north-east (Brugsch). *Naphtuhim* is explained by Brugsch as formed from *Na-pa-thuhi*, "those from the land of Thuhi," a western tribe "who considered themselves of the same race, and as cousins of the Egyptians."

But when we rise from these points of contemporary detail to the more ancient and broader distinctions between the descendants of the

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1889.]

three sons of Noah, these independent sources of information fail us, and we find many questions cropping up which are either not answered in this chapter at all, or receive a different answer from what we should expect. It is suggested by philologists that the names Shem, Ham, Japheth, themselves express outward differences of appearance, seen also in the several races of their descendants. "*Ham*" is generally understood to be connected with a root which, both in the Semitic languages and in Egyptian, signifies *to be black* or *sunburnt*. The Egyptians call their own country the land of *Kam* or *Kemi*, evidently from the dark, black colour of the arable soil (Brugsch, *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, i. 10); hence "the land of Ham" in Ps. cv. 23, 27; cvi. 22. "*Japheth*" is believed to be connected with a word meaning *to be white*, whose ramifications can be traced both in the Semitic and the Aryan languages. And Professor Sayce has suggested (*Assyrian Lectures*, 146) that "Shem" must, in like manner, be connected with the Assyrian *Shamu*, "*brownish*," or any dark neutral tint. Such a threefold division, however, does not exhaust the varieties of the human race, as distinguished by ethnological science, even when the colour of the skin is the only feature taken into account.

When we turn to the science of language, a similar difficulty presents itself. Languages are provisionally divided into three great families, each marked by its own distinctive characteristics. Two of these may be accurately enough assigned to the "sons of Japheth" and the "sons of Shem," but the third does not belong to those "sons of Ham" who are enumerated here. The Canaanites and Egyptians and Cushites do not speak "Turanian" languages; nor are we in a position to say, with certainty, to which race the "Turanian" tribes belong. The distinction between "Aryan" and "Turanian" is real, as regards both language and physical characteristics; but it belongs to another part of the world, and was originated among a different people from that to which the tenth chapter of Genesis belongs. It *may* represent a subordinate distinction among the "sons of Japheth," but, at all events, we are not introduced in this chapter to any of the Turanian tribes of the early Babylonian history by the names applied to them in the inscriptions. The questions, Who were the Sumeri—the Accadians—nay, the Chaldees themselves? remain unanswered.

While, therefore, in what we know of the various races referred to, we find unmistakable traces of the distinction here drawn—traces which, considering the influence of family and tribal relationships in these early days, and among Eastern races, we should have been surprised not to discover—we also find that here, as well as in its account of the creation, the Bible does not undertake to teach us facts of science, or to frame its narrative on scientific principles. We have as little reason to be surprised if we do not find ethnology or philology taken account of here, as when we find geology and its kindred sciences ignored in the first chapter of Genesis. Other relationships than that of mere physical descent may,

according to Eastern usage, be implied in the sonship of Ham, or Shem, or Japheth.

One difficulty of an historical kind, that long obscured a part of the tenth chapter, has been so far removed by the discovery of the early history of the Babylonian plains. Even comparatively recent writers found it difficult to recognise the possibility of any other than Semitic tribes having ruled in Babylonia; and the story of the empire of Nimrod the Cushite seemed hopelessly beyond confirmation. It cannot be said that the ancient records have as yet thrown any light, of a truly historical kind, upon the person or the history of Nimrod. It is still a quite unsettled point whether any of the great names of the inscriptions really represent Nimrod himself. The common custom of translating these ancient names or epithets from one language into another prevents us, for example, from finding anything, even in the deluge-legend of Assyria, that corresponds, letter for letter, with the names of Noah or his sons. And the same appears to have been the case with the name of Nimrod, unless, indeed, his history should yet be discovered in process of research. Lenormant follows older Hebraists in connecting the name with the Semitic root *marad*, "rebellious," and some such feature in his history may probably have occasioned the Semitic name. Some have been inclined to identify Nimrod with different characters in the Babylonian mythology, as with the god Merodach, whose name offers a tempting resemblance, or with the principal hero of the great Epic of which the deluge-legend forms an episode; while others bring him down to a much later period, and find him in the founder of a conquering dynasty of Elamite Cossæans (Cushites) that superseded the older kings. The view that he is represented by the hero of the great Babylonian Epic, has been suggested by George Smith in his "Chaldean Genesis," and more fully illustrated by Lenormant in his paper on "*La Deluge et l'Epopée Babylonienne*." There can be no doubt it has much in its favour. The evidently proverbial associations of his name, as indicated in Gen. x. 9, correspond well with the position of one whose life and adventures formed the groundwork of an ancient romance. He reigns over four cities, as Nimrod does; two of them, Babylon and Erech, bear the same names, both in the Bible and in the poem. The Bible calls him "a mighty hunter before the Lord;" in the poem, he captures alive a winged bull, and delivers his country from a marine monster which ravished the land. The Bible seems to imply that his kingdom at Babylon and the neighbouring cities were erected on the basis of a previously existing civil organisation; the poem so describes his conquests as to make it clear that they were the result of a conflict of different races for supremacy in the land.

For, though we have no direct historical proof that there actually was a Cushite empire, with Nimrod at its head, yet the whole early history of Babylonia, as revealed in the inscriptions, shows us that, in the earliest times, that country was the place where many different

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

tribes met and struggled for dominion. An extensive and most fertile plain, in the midst of rough mountains on the one side, and arid deserts on the other, it could not but be the object of the ambition of any people that grew too numerous for their former home and had capable men to lead them. From the mountains of Elam on the east came Accadians, Elamites, Kassi (Cossæans); while "Arabians" pressed in from the south. And each new invasion, or new victory of some resident tribe, was the occasion of fresh movements among the neighbouring peoples, which extended as far west as Egypt, and influenced the isolated course of history there.

"At the earliest period," says Lenormant (*Magie*, p. 266), "to which the monuments carry us back, we distinguish two principal elements in the population of Chaldea and Babylonia, two great nations,—those of Sumir and Accad. The principal mass of the Accadians is settled specially in the southern provinces, near the Persian Gulf, in Chaldea properly so called, . . . the mass of the people of Sumir is on the north in Babylonia, in what is called in the Bible the plain of Shinar, a name which, according to the phonetic laws of the Accadian language, is only a variation of Sumir." The words Sumir and Accad both belong to the Accadian language. "Their meaning is very plain; it is purely topographical, and must have been applied at first to two divisions of the same race, according to the locality they inhabited. *Accad* means 'mountain,' *Accadi*, 'mountaineers.' . . . As to *Sumeri*, they are 'the people of the river' or 'rivers.' . . . When that branch of the Turanian race, whose language we call Accadian, first established itself in the basin of the Euphrates and Tigris, . . . it was divided into two great tribes, named after their respective situations—Sumir and Accad—the former on the banks of the Tigris, the latter on the mountains on the east and north; and when the Accadians afterwards descended from their mountains to the southern plains of Chaldea, the two peoples preserved their ancient names, although these did not correspond with their new geographical position" (*Magie*, pp. 271, 272, *note*). To these early Turanian inhabitants of the country are undoubtedly owing the first germs of the high civilisation which afterwards covered it, and which, as is most frequently the case, was developed from the mixture of two different races. M. Lenormant thinks that English scholars have exaggerated the part played by the Accadians, and allows that he himself may hardly have kept within proper bounds in stating the case. His estimate of the matter is, that when they came down to the plains, they possessed the rudiments of the hieroglyphic system of writing which was developed into the cuneiform; that they were already acquainted with the metals, and the products of certain arts; and that, arrived at the plains, they built cities, cultivated the land, and carried out works of irrigation. But he concludes, from the poverty of their original vocabulary, that their civilisation was far from being, as has been alleged, the "substructure of the learned culture of Babylonia."

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

We have preserved to us a large number of names borne by early kings of different Babylonian cities. But, except in a few cases, we have no clue to their chronology, or the order of their succession, and little indication of the races to which they belonged, except the language in which their names are formed. Among the first facts we meet with, having any significance in connection with the Bible history, are, that at a period stated in an inscription of Assur-bani-pal to have been 1635 years before his time (660 B.C.), an Elamite king, named Kudur-nan-hundi, overran and conquered the country; and that another king, whose name begins with the same word *Kudur*—Kudur-mabuk—is described as "Lord of Syria," or "Conqueror of the West." Whether or not we are to infer from these indications the existence of a dynasty of Elamite kings reigning consecutively in Babylonia, there can be no doubt that the name Chedorlaomer is of the same formation. No such combination has as yet been found in the inscriptions, but *Lagammar* is known as the name of an Elamite divinity, and *Kudur* means "servant," or "worshipper," corresponding to the Hebrew *Ebed*. Pressure from behind had evidently driven the warlike mountaineers of Elam down upon the Chaldean plain; and the ravaging of the West, to which both Genesis and the monumental notices of Kudur-mabuk bear witness, suggests considerable consolidation of power, especially in the case of one who could command the service or the alliance of so many neighbouring chiefs as followed Chedorlaomer to the Jordan valley. Much more may yet be discovered to complete the story; but even already, the strange forms of these four Eastern kings that seem, in the Scripture narrative, to fall upon the cities of the plain like a thunder-bolt out of a clear sky, have their places henceforth on the ordinary stage of history. The somewhat mysterious title, "King of Nations," has also found its explanation; for these *Goyim* are, with reason, believed to be the *Gutium* of the inscriptions—a designation of the tribes then inhabiting the country afterwards known as Assyria.

It was only very gradually that the Semitic tribes, whom we afterwards know as Babylonians and Assyrians, came to be the dominant power in Chaldea. We are probably to conceive of them as for many generations leading a nomadic life on the plains to the north and west of Sumir and Accad. "The Assyrian tribes," says Lenormant, "long retained their nomadic habits. We have a curious proof of this in the fact that the word which, in Assyrian, signifies 'city,' and which appears to have been peculiar to Assyria proper, was *alu*, radically and etymologically identical with the Hebrew *ohel*, 'tent.' At Babylon, it seems, the word used was *ér*, which has passed into the Hebrew in the same sense. Of this vocable we find no natural Semitic etymology, but it is no doubt to be traced to the Accadian *Ur*" (*Magie*, p. 274, note). This Accadian *Ur* is identical with the name of the city from which Terah and his family began their westward migration. *Ur* had, in the course of time, become the capital of the Accadian monarchy. Its



CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

kings had succeeded in suppressing the petty states of Babylonia, and had assumed the title of "Kings of Sumir and Accad." But Sumir itself was already passing "into the hands of Semitic conquerors. Even in Accad, the power of the old race was on the decline, and the fall of the supremacy of Ur brought with it the final overthrow of Accadian rule" (Sayce, *Babylonian Literature*, p. 23).

There is abundant evidence that this city of Ur is represented by the ruins of *Mugheir*, on the right bank of the Euphrates, about halfway between Babylon and the Persian Gulf. That this, and not a more northern place with a similar name, is meant, appears to be indicated by the appellation, "*Ur-Chasdim*"—"Ur of the Chaldees." For we find in the inscriptions that the name *Kaldi* or *Kasdi* is applied to an Accadian tribe living in the southern part of Babylonia. Schrader (*Keilinschriften u. A. T.*, 43) says that this interchange of *s* and *l* is one which, though not common in the other Semitic languages, is very frequently met with in the Assyrian. "The identity of the names *Chasdim* and *Kaldi* is therefore undoubted." At the same time, it is not clear in which form of the name we are to seek its explanation. Professor Sayce says, "the word *Casdim* is best explained by the Assyrian root, *casadu*, 'to possess,' or 'conquer,' so that the *Casdim* will be those Semitic 'conquerors' who first settled in Sumir or Shinar, and finally succeeded in extirpating the power and the language of their Accadian predecessors" (*Assyrian Lectures*, p. 61). Lenormant, however, adhering to the fact that the Chaldeans are known as an Accadian tribe, gives a different view of their "conquest":—

"The Chaldeans," he says (*Manual*, i. 346), "imposed themselves equally on the two great constitutional elements of the population of the country, no doubt by conquests, and remained there as a superior and learned caste, having both sacerdotal and military supremacy. They were already established among the Accadians in the time of Abraham, when the great city of Ur was already called 'Ur of the Chaldees,' and even earlier, when the Semitic tribe from which the Hebrews sprung was designated by the name Arphaxad, which signifies 'border of the Chaldeans.' Their original country seems to have been the mountains north-east of Mesopotamia, where the classical geographers place nations of the name of Chaldæi, Carduchi, Gordiæi, and where the Kurdish tribes still live."

The city of Ur, besides being one of the early seats of monarchy, was also a great religious centre, and was adorned by successive monarchs with massive temples, whose ruins still mark its site. These temples were erected to Sin, the moon-god, who was the special deity of the place.

The religion of these ancient Chaldees has a double interest for us. Joshua reminds the Israelites (xxiv. 2) that their fathers—Terah being specially named—dwelt in old times on the other side of the river, and that they served other gods. And when we come down to the later period of Israel's history, we find them again brought into contact at Babylon with the same old primitive religion in the last stage of its

(CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.)

development, and with its priests still bearing the name of the ancient tribe from whom its first elements had been derived, and still practising, as "magicians," the ancient rites of Accad. For the popular foundation of the old Chaldee religion was the same sort of Shamanism still found among the Turanian tribes of the East.

"The great magical work, of which the scribes of Assur-bani-pal executed several copies from that which existed from a remote antiquity in the library of the famous sacerdotal school of Erech, was composed of three distinct books. We know the title of one of the three, 'The Evil Spirits.' . . . As the title indicates, it was exclusively filled with formulæ of conjuration and imprecations, intended to repel demons and other evil spirits, to avert their fatal influence, and to ward off their blows. A second book shows itself, in what remains of it, to have been formed of a collection of incantations, to which was attributed the power of healing maladies. Lastly, the third contains hymns to certain gods, to the singing of which was ascribed a supernatural and mysterious power, and which have a very different character from the properly liturgical hymns of the official [Assyrian] religion, some of which have also been preserved. It is curious to note that the three parts which thus make up the great magical work . . . correspond exactly to the three classes of Chaldean doctors which the Book of Daniel enumerates, along with the astrologers and diviners (*Kasdim* and *guzrim*)—that is to say, the *Khartunim* or exorcists, the *hakamim* or physicians, and the *asaphim* or theosophs. The farther we advance in the knowledge of the cuneiform texts, the more we recognise the necessity of revising the condemnation passed, much too prematurely, by the German school of exegesis on the Book of Daniel. No doubt, the language, filled in certain places with Greek words, bears evidence that the final editing of the book, as we have it, is posterior to Alexander. But the groundwork dates from a much older time. It bears the impress of a perfectly characteristic Babylonian colouring, and the features of life at the Court of Nebuchadnezzar and his successors have a truth and accuracy which could not have been reached some centuries later" (Lenormant, *Magie*, p. 13).

With such magical beliefs and rites, the ancient Chaldee religion combined the worship of many of the divinities with which we afterwards become acquainted in the times of the Assyrian empire. But the vast and complicated system of Assyrian and Babylonian mythology was not fully developed and organised in these early times. The carefully-ordered hierarchy in which the gods came afterwards to be arranged, seems to have been the result of the conquest of Chaldea by a Semitic tribe, and their appropriation of the religion of the conquered races. We quote again from Lenormant :—

"In spite of its incompleteness, for want of sufficiently numerous documents, our acquaintance with the ancient history of Chaldea, before the development of the Assyrian power, is sufficient to permit us to affirm that the definitive system of the Chaldeo-Babylonian religion, with its divine hierarchy and its series of successive emanations, is the result of a great sacerdotal evolution. It was almost a religious revolution, which offers more than one point of analogy with the transformation which the old Vedic religion underwent in India, under the influence of the colleges of Brahmins. We have positive proofs of the previous state

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

of religion. In the pretty numerous inscriptions of the first dynasties of the ancient Chaldean empire which have come down to us, we find no trace of the learned systematising of the Pantheon. . . . The names of the gods are the same which are employed afterwards, but these divine personages are not grouped and subordinated in a regular hierarchy. They have an almost exclusively local character. Each of them is worshipped with his wife in one town where he has his principal sanctuary, and there he is regarded as the chief of the gods. Thus, Anu reigns at Erech, Bel at Nipur, Sin at Ur, Samas at Sippara, where he is associated with Anunit. Marduk [Merodach] is one of the gods of Babylon, Nebo is the god of Borsippa, while Nergal was worshipped at Cutha. (Compare 2 Kings xvii. 30, 31.) We can fix an approximate date for the religious revolution now indicated. It is that of the rise of the dynasty of Aganê, in Babylonia proper, of which Sargon I. was the head" (*Magie*, p. 113).

Aganê is the name of one of the twin cities of Sepharvaim, which stood opposite one another on the banks of the Euphrates. They were otherwise called *Sipar sa Samas*, or "Sippara of the Sun," and *Sipar sa Anunit*, or "Sippara of Anunit." Sargon of Aganê occupies a fully more important place in the inscriptions hitherto discovered than any other of these early monarchs. There is a strange story of his birth, which recalls the history of Moses and the legend of Romulus and Remus. He rose to power, not by any hereditary right, but by his own genius and energy; and he is celebrated to subsequent generations as a conqueror, a founder of cities, and a patron of such literature as then existed. He carried his arms from Elam on the East to the "Sea of the setting Sun." To him is constantly ascribed, in later documents, the formation of a collection of sacred books, and the compilation of a manual of astrological science, from which the library of Assur-bani-pal obtained very many of its ancient materials. And, according to Lenormant, there is sufficient ground for pointing to the period when his power was established, as that when the religious "evolution," of which we have spoken, with its system completely formed, definitively asserted its influence over the whole country. It would be outside our present purpose to enter into any detailed account of this elaborate system of Chaldeo-Assyrian mythology, as it is only individual names of its deities which we find mentioned in the Bible. But it is interesting to find that the Semitic system places, at the head of the Pantheon, a god whose character and attributes seem to have been unknown to the unorganised polytheism of the preceding races. "The Supreme God," says Lenormant, "the sole first principle from which sprang all the other gods, was *Ilu* (the equivalent of the Hebrew *El*), whose name signifies "God" *par excellence*. He is the One and the Good, which the Neoplatonic philosophers said was the common source of all in the Chaldean theology; and, in fact, we find the first principle called 'the Good One' in some documents of that later time, when the philosophical language was completely formed in the schools of the priesthood."

Of the time of Sargon I. of Aganê, we can say that it was the period

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

of the consummation of many changes—political, social, and religious—among the inhabitants of the Babylonian plains. Not that the power of the Semitic kings was allowed from this time to grow unchecked, for the dynasty of Sargon seems to have been overthrown by a powerful conqueror called “King of the Kassî,” who fixed the seat of his empire at Babylon itself. But the transference of power does not seem to have had the effect of overthrowing the institutions of the country, or disturbing its civilisation.

In the absence of any definite chronology, it is impossible to attempt to estimate in detail the bearing of these events upon the contemporaneous incidents of the narrative of Scripture. The fact of Chedorlaomer’s invasion of the Jordan valley occurring shortly after Abraham had entered the land, naturally inclines us to connect Terah’s migration from Ur of the Chaldees with the Elamite domination in Chaldea. That country could hardly continue to be a fitting home for a peaceful tribe of shepherds, when it was overrun by so warlike a people, who drew the surrounding states along with them in their military undertakings. The first westward movement of the chosen race occupies but a small place in the Bible history ; and to the kings and conquerors of the day, who have left the record of their names and their doings on the buildings they reared, it was a matter of utter indifference—an indistinguishable ripple among the great waves of popular migration that were taking place at the time. But, in all probability, God withdrew the family of the promise, by that very means, from the growing influence of the heathenism around them, which was becoming more and more imposing in its edifices and its ritual, and in the outer meshes of which some of them would seem to have been already entangled, when they “served other gods on the other side of the flood.”

ANDREW MELVILLE.

## HEROES OF THE REFORMATION.

### I.—PATRICK HAMILTON.

“And on his breast a bloody cross he bore,  
The dear remembrance of his dying Lord,  
For whose sweet sake that glorious badge he wore,  
And dead, as living ever, Him adored.”—SPENSER.

**P**ERHAPS few people now-a-days care for any closer acquaintance with the ancient town of Linlithgow than can be made during a few minutes’ halt at its somewhat dreary railway station, where the traveller looks out of the carriage windows upon high old houses, narrow dirty streets, and, farther away, the ruins of a great castle and church, and the shimmer of water through the trees behind them. And yet,

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

during that short stay, one can scarcely fail to turn to pictures of the past, when Linlithgow was the Windsor of Scotland, its palace the fairest of all those "built for the royal dwelling," the scene of much of the proud, wild, and changeful life that was lived at the Court of the Stuarts. Those gray walls once rang with the sounds of revelry by which James IV. sought to drown the voices that warned him of his own approaching doom and Scotland's sorrow : within their shelter was born the queen whose beauty, whose misfortunes, and alas ! whose crimes have gained her world-wide fame. There, too, long after, the followers of Bonnie Prince Charlie made one of their last rallying-points, ere the glory of Linlithgow finally perished with the hopes of the Stuart line, and the Jacobite army, marching sadly northward, left the beautiful palace a blackened ruin.

But other memories which linger round Linlithgow are infinitely sweet as well as heart-stirring—memories of the brief, bright life of him whom Scotland calls her first Reformer. After the lapse of three centuries and a-half, it is impossible to read the history of Patrick Hamilton without feeling something of the peculiarly tender and admiring love his contemporaries bore for him. Among the chivalry of God, he was indeed a knight *sans peur et sans reproche*. Young, high-born, rich and gifted, with splendid worldly prospects, he forsook all, and followed Christ with a brave and loyal devotion which seemed unconscious of any sacrifice. For him there was neither doubt nor faltering, neither fear nor failure. His life-work was short, but brilliantly successful ; the conflict sharp, but ending in complete victory. The martyr's crown and the rest of God were won before he was four-and-twenty.

Patrick Hamilton was born in the year 1504, and probably spent his early days in the house of Kincael in Linlithgowshire. His parents were both of royal blood—being grand-children of James II., and cousins of the king who fell on Flodden Field—and their relatives and connections were naturally among the most powerful nobles of the land. The adventures of the head of the house himself were worthy of the pages of a romance, for he was a true knight of the olden time, and had upheld the honour of Scotland at many a gay tournament, both at home and in foreign courts. His boys, looking up to him with the admiration of affectionate childhood, would probably long to imitate his exploits ; but the career which the father planned for his younger son was very unlike his own. Patrick was destined for the priesthood, and as he grew up into a clever, book-loving boy, his parents doubtless congratulated themselves on the wisdom of their choice of a career for him. His birth would ensure him high preferment and a place at court ; his talents might be expected to gain him power and influence ; and as these were the days when churchmen ruled kings, no hopes of future greatness which they might entertain for their child were beyond the bounds of possibility.

As the traditional alliance between France and Scotland was still



(CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.)

strong at that time, and the University of Paris was famed through all Europe, there was little difficulty in deciding where Patrick was to carry on his studies. There was no lack of money for the boy's education, for the abbacy of Ferne had been conferred on him, and its revenues appropriated to his use. So to Paris he went, when about thirteen years old, followed, doubtless, by the yearnings of his mother's heart.

But One infinitely wiser than his earthly parents was directing the path of the young Scottish student for his own good and the good of his country. In Paris, at that time, not only intellectual but religious life showed unprecedented vigour. The doctrines of the German Reformer, solemnly discussed in the University, and fervently taught by at least one of the professors, were burning questions among the students. Luther's books were circulated and eagerly read, and his followers came in great numbers to the University, under the openly-avowed protection of Francis I. himself. In the Court itself there were not wanting pure-hearted disciples of Jesus Christ, among them a royal princess and poetess, the king's only and darling sister, the beautiful Margaret of Valois.

Three years of the most impressionable period of his life were spent by Patrick Hamilton in Paris, where he caught the new enthusiasm for learning which Erasmus had aroused, and heard on all sides of the long-forgotten Gospel which Luther's words had recalled. Just as he was emerging from boyhood, the shadow of death fell on the Kincavel household, and the lonely young student at Paris, far from mother and sister and the friends of his childhood, suddenly learned that he was fatherless. A Parliament had been called at Edinburgh, and the Scottish nobles, after their proud, rough fashion, had assembled there, all attended by their men-at-arms. The Douglasses and Hamiltons—old and bitter enemies—found cause of dispute, and proceeded to settle their differences by a street-fight, which was afterwards called "Clean the Causeway." In this obscure and unseemly struggle fell Sir Patrick Hamilton of Kincavel, the victim of a quarrel which he had done his best to prevent.

It was impossible, indeed, that his young son had known nothing of bereavement before. For one could scarcely live even a child's life in Scotland, in these wild times, without being touched by some tragedy; and Patrick Hamilton, at nine years of his age, must have heard the wail of his country over Flodden's stricken field. But this seems to have been his first heart-rending grief. Perhaps, too, it was then that he first learned to recognise a Divine and Immortal Friend, pitiful as a father, tenderly comforting as a mother, the Christ from whose love there can be no separation.

Hamilton took his degree at Paris in 1520, after which he probably went to study at Louvain, only returning to Scotland two years afterwards. His elder brother was now master of Kincavel and Sheriff of Linlithgowshire—an honest, much-respected man, already married, and the father

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

of several children. The family ties between the Hamiltons were very strong, and the old house was still their mother's home ; but it was no place for an enthusiastic student of eighteen to settle in permanently. Patrick passed on to St. Andrews, but of what happened during the time he spent there, we can only judge by the results. During that quiet period, he was developing into the brilliant scholar whose talents were to shed a lustre on Philip of Hesse's university, the reformer before whose words priestly tyrants were to quail, the patriot who was so willingly to lay down his life for his country's sake. Moreover, he was growing in the knowledge of Christ and likeness to Him, and gaining a holy joy and a steadfast faith, such as many of God's people never attain during the course of long lives.

Of human help he had probably little or none, for St. Andrews at that time is described as the capital of the kingdom of darkness, and the light that afterwards burned there was kindled by Hamilton himself. But we hear that he studied the Bible until he knew it with a thoroughness which seemed marvellous to the pious foreign theologian who afterwards became his friend. And turning from its pages to the life around him, his heart grew sore for the ignorance and misery of his countrymen, and he longed to tell them the glad tidings which had brought such great joy to him. Probably it was only by slow degrees that he became conscious of the bondage of the Church to whose service he had been devoted as a child. All we know is, that the golden fetters with which Rome had weighted him so early, were powerless to hold him in his manhood. The boy-abbot of Ferne stood forth as Christ's freeman when he first preached at St. Andrews, and the year 1527 began.

None of the words of Hamilton's spoken sermons have come down to us, but there is no doubt that their burden was the same as that of his theses, published afterwards in Germany. Salvation by Christ alone was the message he never wearied of telling. "Knowest thou what this saying means—*Christ died for thee?* Thou shouldest have died perpetually, but that Christ, to deliver thee from death, died for thee, and changed thy perpetual death into His own death. Thou madest the fault, and He suffered the pain, and that for the love He bore to thee. Therefore *do* nothing to Him, but *take of* Him ; for He is a gentle Lord, and will give us all things that we need with a gladder heart than we take them of Him. He hath delivered thee from condemnation, and desireth nought of thee but that thou shouldest acknowledge what He hath done for thee, and help others for His sake, even as He hath helped thee for nought and without reward."

Brave, bright words, which ring sweetly in our ears across the centuries, and must have been heaven's own music to many a sad soul, listening in the darkness which then covered Scotland ! But to James Beaton, Archbishop of St. Andrews, and those whom he styled the "most reverend fathers in God, abbots, doctors of theology, professors of the Holy Scriptures, and masters of the University," they sounded like

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

the war-cry of an enemy, rising in the midst of one of their safest strongholds. If that voice were not silenced, there would soon be an end of their boast that Scotland had always been free from the foul and wicked influence of the apostate German monk. So Hamilton was summoned before the Archbishop to answer for "disputing, holding and maintaining divers heresies of Martin Luther, already condemned by general councils and most famous universities."

Patrick Hamilton came of a race which knew not what fear was, but he felt himself still very young and ignorant, and longed for more Christian fellowship and teaching ere he took up the full burden of his Master's service. His work at St. Andrews was stopped for the present; in Germany he could find the brotherly sympathy and help he needed, so he took ship, along with three of his friends, and crossed the sea to Luther's land. Fain would we believe that the brave, large-hearted Saxon Reformer and his gentle scholarly friend welcomed and cheered the young Scotsman; but modern historians throw doubt on the fact of Hamilton's ever having visited Wittenberg at all. Certain it is, however, that he remained several months at Marburg, where the Landgrave of Hesse had newly founded a university, and where Lambert, Frith, and Tyndale then resided. Here Hamilton composed and maintained the theses that were afterwards translated into English under the title of "Patrick's Places," and from which a few sentences have been quoted.

All the university was proud of the noble and gifted student, but Hamilton's nature never struck its roots into German soil, and the honour he won could not hold him there. His heart turned back to his own benighted and priest-ridden land, all the more tenderly because the contrast was so great between it and the bright foreign one he had learned to know. No one lived what he preached more nobly than Hamilton did, and he felt it was in the country of his birth that Christ desired him to "acknowledge what had been done" for him, and help others for his Saviour's sake, "for nought and without reward." So, in spite of the entreaties and forebodings of his friends, he returned to Scotland, where the doors of his childhood's home gladly opened to receive him.

He remained at Kincavel till the beginning of another year; and into these last months of the martyr's life, heaven and earth seemed to crowd their best blessings. It was as if God had let His servant taste all the sweetness that life could give, ere He bade him turn away and take up the bitter cup of death. A preacher's dearest wishes of popularity and success in his work were granted him in large measure. He visited and taught among the cottagers who had known him all his life, and they heard him gladly, as the common people heard his Master long ago. He preached in the church at Linlithgow, where not only townsfolk, but gay courtiers, knights, and ladies thronged to listen. The sensation he caused was immense, and we know of one at least of his hearers who was moved to follow his steps so closely, that he too reached heaven by

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

the martyr's road. But, perhaps, it was a rarer thing, as it doubtless seemed to himself more blessed, that Hamilton's influence was nowhere so strong as in his own family ; and the heart's desire and prayer which many have to cherish through long sad years of waiting, were changed for him thus early into all the gladness of thanksgiving. Mother, brother, and sister believed and rejoiced when he told them of a Saviour's finished work, and a gentle Lord ready to give them all they needed. The strength of their convictions was shown in after years, when James and Katharine Hamilton bravely kept the faith which their young brother had committed to their charge before his own good fight was done.

Sweet must have been the family intercourse at Kincavel during these last days ; but another and more wonderful affection than that of mother or sister then threw its beauty over Hamilton's life. We cannot tell whether the "noble young maiden" he won as a bride had grown dear through the tender familiarity of early acquaintance, or whether he saw her first in all the grace of her womanhood. These were the days of *mariages de convenance*, but surely if ever there was a love-match this was one ; for the young husband willed away his last claims to rich possessions, and defied his bitter and dangerous enemies when he uttered his marriage-vows. The wedding was celebrated privately about the beginning of January, 1528 ; only very near friends seem to have known the fact at the time, and not even the name of the wife, so soon to be widowed, has come down to us.

Before that month was over, there came another summons for Hamilton to appear before the Archbishop. This time it was warily worded, so as not to alarm ; for Beaton probably felt that the Sheriff of Linlithgow was perfectly able to defend his brother as long as he was under his protection, and that the King, who had a decided liking for the family at Kincavel, would be well pleased that he should do so. It was not to be tried for heresy, therefore, but to confer about needful reforms in the Church that Hamilton was summoned to St. Andrews. The call seemed to him a Divine one,—his Master's voice bidding him give his testimony to the truth, in all the publicity of an ecclesiastical council, in his own university town. For the rest, it seems unlikely that the Archbishop's fair words misled either his friends or him in the least. We are told that those who loved Hamilton implored him to remain with them, and that he himself was impressed with the conviction that he was going to St. Andrews to die. Nevertheless, he hesitated not. He bade farewell to his aged mother and the young wife whose honeymoon was not yet over, and left the safe shelter of his father's house for ever.

The reception Hamilton met with at St. Andrews was courteous, and even flattering. He was not only permitted but encouraged to receive all who came to him in private, and he had full liberty of public speech in the very halls of the university itself. Moreover, the Archbishop and

other dignitaries, in their intercourse with him, seemed to agree with much that he said, and readily allowed the great necessity of reformation in the Church. What was the meaning of this conduct it is rather difficult to decide. Perhaps—being men after all, and not fiends—their desire, at first, was not so much to give their victim rope enough to hang himself with, as to find out what chance there was of bringing him again within the pale of the Church. For they must have felt that, in many ways, it would be a greater triumph to make Hamilton recant than to murder him; and then they had to take into account the inconvenience, and even danger to themselves, of proceeding to extremities with a heretic who bore the name of a fierce and powerful family, and counted kindred with royalty itself. Nor could the idea that Hamilton might be coaxed or frightened into submission have seemed an unlikely one to Beaton, who was no bigot, but a worldly, ambitious man, that had set his heart on the good things of this life, and esteemed no calamity so great as the loss of these. How could he, or his like-minded nephew David, or any of the godless, shameless crew of priests they commanded, understand how any one could deliberately prefer the reproach of Christ to all the treasures of this world? But whatever their expectations were, they soon began to find out that the spirit they had to deal with was a very different one from their own. Patrick, Abbot of Ferne, welcomed the opportunities of conference which they gave him—not to explain away, or gently renounce his opinions, but to set them forth boldly, and maintain them with unshaken tenacity. And the Spirit of God, speaking through his genius and scholarship, made Hamilton's words at St. Andrews such as none of his adversaries were able to gainsay or resist.

Among those who visited him in his lodgings was a young canon, named Alane or Alesius, on whose learning and zeal his ecclesiastical superiors built the highest hopes. They had boasted he would convince Luther himself, if that arch-heretic had but the privilege of hearing his arguments, so it was not unnatural that both they and he considered the task of bringing Hamilton to reason as one to which he was fully equal. Eagerly, therefore, did Alesius prepare to oppose those new doctrines which his fellow-countryman had learned in foreign universities, and now dared to introduce into orthodox Scotland in defiance of all the venerable authority of the Church of his fathers. But the event proved very different from what had been expected. Alesius did not convert Hamilton; it was Hamilton who converted Alesius. The words spoken in these quiet rooms, burned into the soul of the listener by the honour and the glory of the tragedy he afterwards witnessed, changed the course of his life, and brought the praised and petted canon of St. Andrews through the depths of suffering and shame. But, far away in the German land where the reformer Alesius found refuge at last, he turned back to bless the memory of the friend of his youth; and as one who had faithfully obeyed the message which God's servant had brought



CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

him, he could look forward to meeting Hamilton again in the day when the confessors of Jesus Christ shall be acknowledged before the angels in heaven.

Another story, like, and yet sadly unlike that of Alesius, is told of those times at St. Andrews. A friar, named Alexander Campbell, clever and learned as the young canon was, had been sent by the Archbishop on the same mission to Hamilton. And the results were apparently the same. He, too, was unable to withstand the power of Hamilton's reasoning and his earnest eloquence ; he listened and admired, he seemed to love him ; more than all, he recognised the truth of God in the words of the suspected heretic. Their intercourse had merged into friendship, when Campbell was startled by an order to visit the Archbishop, and give an account of the progress he had made in reclaiming Hamilton from his errors. Then his eyes were opened to see his true position. He had not hitherto counted the cost of following Christ ; but suddenly realising it now, he felt that it was greater than he was ready to pay. He would not trust the promise that those who lose their lives for Jesus' sake shall receive them again for evermore ; this present world was very dear to him, and the prospect of dishonour and physical suffering too horrible to face. In an agony of cowardice, he played the traitor to his conscience and to his friend ; he stifled and denied his own convictions, and, eager to gain favour with the Archbishop, repeated Hamilton's frank statements to swell the evidence that was being collected to condemn him.

For by this time it had become plain that there was only one way of silencing Hamilton, and Beaton and his friends were preparing to strike suddenly and surely when the hour arrived. But they had first to make certain that there would be no interference on the part of the King. It is true that James was still under the control of the Douglasses, who were not at all likely to aid him in protecting one of the rival race of Hamilton ; but he was now seventeen years of age, and the time of his escape from the guardians he hated could not be far distant. Crafty and politic as the Beatons were, they must have known that royal pleadings, unheeded now, might be remembered afterwards to the disadvantage of those who had scorned them. So they determined to prevent anything of the sort, by persuading the boy that his soul's health would be improved by a pilgrimage to the shrine of St. Duthac, in Ross-shire, where his father had been wont to go every year. Weak, superstitious, and untrustworthy as he was, James V. had a kindly heart ; and we may surely hope that he took his journey northwards in all simplicity, believing that the priests meant no harm to his cousin.

As soon, however, as the King had gone, Hamilton was ordered to appear at the Archbishop's palace and answer a charge of heresy. Bravely, nay, even eagerly, he came, and heard a long list of accusations, on each article of which he was examined by the Court. It was then announced that a few days would be taken to deliberate on the

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

matter, and the final sentence would be publicly pronounced on the last day of the month.

Meanwhile, however, the news of Hamilton's danger had roused his friends to arms. Sir James Hamilton assembled the men of Linlithgow, and set out to rescue his brother; and nearer, a weaker attempt was made by a gentleman of the name of Duncan, who took the field with a band of retainers. It must have been an anxious time for the Beaton, in spite of all their precautions. But, as it turned out, there was no need to fight Sir James Hamilton's party at all; for a terrible storm, which blew for days in the Frith of Forth, prevented them crossing into Fife, and the Archbishop found his own cavalry quite strong enough to overpower Duncan and his men. So there was triumph in Beaton's palace, and all speed was made with the work in hand, for the time they had for its accomplishment was short.

On the second last night of February, Hamilton was entertaining some friends in his lodgings, when the tramp of armed men was heard without, followed by a knocking at the door. The party at the supper-table all rose together, and went to see what the matter was. They found the house surrounded by soldiers, and were met by a demand for Patrick Hamilton. "I am Hamilton," he replied at once; "let the others go." But his friends hung about him, and would fain have had a promise from the commanding officer that he would be given back to them safe and sound. No heed was paid to their words; in silence and darkness the prisoner was led away, and secured within the castle walls.

The morning which followed was one of intense excitement in St. Andrews. The priests were desirous of giving all the effect of dramatic pomp and solemnity to the terrible assertion of their power on which they had resolved, and arrangements were made accordingly. All the great dignitaries of the Church assembled in the cathedral, to act as judges; and priests, students, and citizens thronged eagerly to hear sentence pronounced on the young evangelist who had gone in and out among them for the last month.

Hamilton was brought from prison by an armed escort; and, placed where he could be seen and heard by every one, he confronted that vast assembly all alone. With a refinement of cruelty which was, perhaps, partly meant as a trial of the friar's own constancy, Alexander Campbell had been appointed to read the indictment. Hamilton listened to it with perfect composure; and, ready-witted and courteous as ever, ably sustained his part in the debate that followed. It was his last chance of defending and explaining the faith he professed; and he made the most of it, clinching every argument he used with a quotation from the Scriptures. Again and again he silenced the wretched Campbell, whose conscience all the time bore witness to the truth of what Hamilton said, while memory kept recalling how differently he had heard such words from him before. Finally, the bishops bade the friar

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

conclude the proceedings by calling the prisoner a heretic, and announcing his crimes in a loud voice.

"Heretic!" cried Campbell—but ere he could proceed further, Hamilton interposed.

"My brother," he said very gently, "you do not think me that in your heart."

"Heretic!" repeated the miserable man, "thou hast said that all have a right to read the Word of God. Thou hast said it is idle to invoke the saints and the Virgin. Thou hast said it is vain to say masses to release souls from purgatory."

"Nothing can purify the souls of men," said Hamilton, "but the blood of Jesus Christ."

At that Campbell turned round to bid the Archbishop observe how the obstinate heretic despised the authority of the Pope. "My lord," he said, "I do not need to accuse him any more."

Unanimously, then, they voted him guilty, and Beaton stood up to read the sentence. "We, James, by the mercy of God, Archbishop of St. Andrews and Primate of Scotland, having God and the integrity of our faith before our eyes, and following the counsel and advice of the professors of the Holy Scripture, men of law, and others assisting us for the time, do pronounce, determine, and declare Patrick Hamilton to be a heretic, and to have an evil opinion of the faith. We therefore, by this our sentence definitive, do condemn him to be deprived of all honours, orders, offices, and benefices of the Church, and pronounce him to be delivered over to the secular arm to be punished, and his goods confiscated."

Then the paper was laid on the table and signed with many names. Next to that of the bloodthirsty and unscrupulous David Beaton, the primate's nephew, stands the signature of Hepburn, afterwards bishop of Moray, who, among all the abandoned clergy of that time, was perhaps the most brutal and shameless. And the long list was finished up with the names of some of the young noblemen then studying at St. Andrews; among them that of the Earl of Cassilis, a child of twelve or thirteen. Too young to understand what he did, and perhaps rather pleased with his own importance, the poor boy was brought on the scene to add the weight of his title to the solemnity of the sentence pronounced, and obediently wrote as his guardians told him, under the compassionate eyes of the man whose death-warrant he was signing.

Whenever Hamilton's doom was made public, the chances of a rescue became so great, that his captors, determined to keep fast hold of their prey, had to act both swiftly and cautiously. He was taken back to the castle by an escort several thousands strong, and preparations for carrying out the sentence against him were begun immediately. The condemned prisoner was still sitting at the table where he had taken his noon-day meal, when the message came summoning him to execution.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

"Is all ready?" he asked calmly; but the governor of the castle, to whom he put the question, could not answer for emotion. Something he managed to utter about wishing him a better fate, and Hamilton, seeing how it was, sprang up and took hold of his hand, as if he felt it his part to comfort and sympathise. "Let us go," he said then; and clasping the copy of the New Testament he always carried with him, he went out to meet his death.

In front of the Old College, the stake had been erected, and the coals and timber piled. A crowd had already gathered on the spot, though men still believed that the end of these hideous preparations would only be to strike terror into wavering hearts, and compel the obstinate heretic to recant. "But God, for His own glory," says Knox, "so strengthened his faithful witness that neither the love of life, nor yet the fear of that cruel death, could move him a jot to swerve from the faith once professed."

When he arrived at the place of execution, Hamilton uncovered his head, and looking up, prayed silently for a few moments. There was no opening visible to mortal sight in the grey northern sky, but surely the martyr, with the eye of faith, beheld the Lord whom Stephen saw. For, after that, the offer sent by Beaton, of pardon on condition of recantation, seemed to strike him as a thing absurd. There was a touch of scorn in his spirited answer. "My belief is in Christ Jesus; therefore I will not deny it for the awe of your fire." Then, confidently referring his case to the hearing of the Judge of all the earth, the excommunicated priest and condemned criminal added, "I appeal from the sentence pronounced against me this day, and commit myself to the mercy of God."

His enemies seem to have fallen back after that for a little, and some of those who loved him drew near. To one he handed his Testament, and then taking off his cloak and cap, he gave them to the servant who had attended him for many years. "These will not profit in the fire, but they will profit thee," he said, kindly. "After this, thou canst receive nothing of me but the example of my death, which, I pray thee, bear in mind. For though it is bitter to the flesh, and fearful before men, yet it is the entrance into eternal life, which none shall possess that deny Christ Jesus."

The hideous details of the torture, which lasted all that afternoon, we would fain pass over lightly. Thrice the fire was kindled, and thrice it went out, the third time exploding a train of gunpowder which scorched the martyr's left side. In the midst of the sickening confusion and mismanagement by which his sufferings were prolonged, Hamilton's calm courage never failed him. It seemed, indeed, that he was the only one who retained presence of mind. The suggestion to bring dry wood was his, and patiently he stood waiting till it was fetched from the castle. At last, the flames began to burn slowly. And then, as if excited by the blaze, several friars, standing near, fell to crying, "Convert, heretic! call on our lady! say *salve regina!*"

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

It may be that they gave voice to temptations which were assailing the young man through the instincts of his vigorous bodily life, and the tender longings of human affection. For he turned on them with an answer of sternest rebuke. "Depart from me, messengers of Satan!" But one still hovered round, the last that might have been expected to venture to such a place,—the Prior of the Dominicans, Alexander Campbell. Whether he came there in the vain hope that what was happening might after all be too terrible to be real; or whether it was only that his fears, proving stronger than his remorse, forced him to act out his disgraceful part to the very end, we cannot know. But when others, out of pity or shame, became silent, he persisted in his loud and insulting outcries. Over and over again he called to Hamilton that recantation was the only means of saving his soul. "If you believe the truth of what you say," was the reply, "put one finger in the fire in which I am burning!"

The Dominican dared not accept the public challenge thus to testify to the faith whose efficacy he was urging. He could only betake himself again to vehement and oft-repeated denunciation of Hamilton as a lost heretic.

"Wicked man, thou knowest the contrary, and the contrary to me thou hast confessed," said the martyr at length, in sorrowful solemnity, "I appeal thee before the tribunal seat of Jesus Christ!"

The words in which the dying man called upon God to judge between him and his accuser smote the wretched hypocrite who heard them, as if they had been a curse. The scene before his eyes was growing every moment more awful. A gust of wind blowing suddenly from the sea made the flames stretch their fiery tongues towards him, and added to the horror that seized upon his soul. Wildly he fled from the spot, and took refuge in his home. But he could not escape from the torments of an accusing conscience, or the haunting memory of good forsaken and evil wittingly done. The agony was more than his mind could bear; he went raving mad, and died before many days were over.

When Campbell fled from the terrible sight in front of the Old College, the last struggle was approaching. For nearly six hours Hamilton stood at the stake, and during all that time not one word of weakness or murmuring fell from his lips. To his friends he spoke of his mother, and commended her tenderly to their love. And when the shades of the February evening were stealing over the land, and the flames gleamed lurid through the gathering twilight, those who stood near heard him praying in the midst of the fire, "O Lord, how long shall darkness cover this realm? How long wilt Thou suffer the tyranny of men?" And then, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit!"

He spoke no more, but still they knew that the good soldier of Jesus Christ held by his colours to the very end. For one of the crowd came close to the fire, and implored him, if he still believed the faith he had professed, to make them a sign. And then, through the fiery cloud



[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

that encompassed him, they saw the martyr raise his right hand on high.

One moment more and all was over—Hamilton's body fell down into the flames, and God gathered his heroic soul to rest.

## WHAT CAN BE DONE FOR IRELAND?

**J**UST now, the people must be fed. Humanity recoils at the thought of men and women and little children dying of hunger. But is this all that should be done? Is it enough to meet the present distress by eleemosynary aid? Are these people to be left to make another cycle of misery and hardness, till, by the failure of a crop or a bad harvest, they are reduced again to the starvation-point? There must be something radically wrong when we find a million of human beings within a few hundred miles of London—a people who form a part of the Great British Empire—in periodical danger of starvation. An effort should be made to get at the root of this evil. Some may say it is a small tax on the generosity of wealthy England to tide over the difficulty once in ten or twenty years. But is it creditable to England to allow a portion of her own people—so near her own great capital—to remain in this miserable position from one generation to another? Irishmen feel it to be an unutterable humiliation to be paraded as mendicants before the civilised world. Besides, this whole system of doling out charity to able-bodied men has a demoralising influence. It strikes at the root of their manhood, fosters improvidence, and before it every vestige of self-reliance vanishes away.

It is hardly necessary to mention that this state of things exists mainly in a part of Ireland. Two—perhaps we should say three—of the four provinces are comparatively prosperous. Ulster, Leinster, and part of Munster, like other countries, occasionally feel the pressure of hard times and bad harvests, but, on the whole, they are well to do. It is along the western shores, from Malin Head to Skibbereen, that the population live from hand to mouth and are subject to all the miseries of periodical starvation. In the spirit of patriotism, in the permanent interests of our country, and for the honour of England, we raise the question, "What can be done for Ireland?" Some one says, "Sever the connection with the larger island." In our judgment, that would fill the cup of Ireland's misery to the brim. It is not to be thought of for a moment. The day that separates the two islands seals the doom of Ireland. Some say, "Educate the people; lift them up by intellectual culture." In this direction, however, all has been done that imperial legislation can do. There is not a more complete machinery in the civilised world for the intellectual culture of all classes than that which

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

now prevails in Ireland. The country is permeated by an unrivalled system of common schools. And, lately, intermediate schools and universities have been set up for the benefit of the middle and higher classes. True, this boon was long in coming, but it has come at last. We may hope the costly machinery will alleviate some of the evils complained of, but it will not staunch the wounds of Ireland, and effectually lift the people out of their miserably low condition. Education is one remedy, but not the only one that Ireland needs.

Irishmen feel insulted and irritated by the way in which some men talk of their country. They say the people are indolent, improvident, intemperate, disloyal, and steeped in debasing superstition; in short, they are utterly hopeless. This may be all true, but is it not also true that they have proved themselves capable of achieving great things in every department of warfare, literature, statesmanship, philosophy, and patriotism? They have an instinctive love of learning and religion; and unless terribly oppressed or goaded on by designing agitators, they are ever ready to render becoming homage to their superiors. They are often contented and even cheerful in the midst of great privation, and to a fault they are satisfied with a very low standard of social enjoyment; surely it is worthy the attention and energies of a great nation like England to ameliorate the condition of such a people. They have a stronger claim on the sympathy of Britain than Zulus or Caffirs.

The writer is thoroughly convinced that the great majority of the English people are animated by an honest and earnest desire to do justice to the Irish people, and to apply whatever remedies may be deemed most effectual in making them peaceful, prosperous, and law-abiding. Under this conviction, the following suggestions are submitted to thoughtful men:—

1. Every reasonable effort should be made by the Legislature to disabuse the minds of the people of an idea which has been wrought into every fibre of their being, that they are the victims of unjust, oppressive and intolerant laws. They have drunk in this with their mother's milk. It has been fostered and fanned by priests and so-called patriots, till it has become part of the national creed. This is the fuel that feeds the flame of discontent, disloyalty, and hatred of England. It will take many years of humane, considerate, and generous treatment on the part of England to eradicate this idea, but it must be done if the wounds of Ireland are ever to be healed.

2. Every reasonable encouragement must be given by the Legislature to the industry of the people. They are stigmatised as improvident and lazy. Thoughtful men, who know the position they occupy, do not wonder at their indolence. What motive have they to work hard? They would be more than human if they did so without any reasonable prospect of thereby adding to their personal and domestic comfort. If we expect them to live and labour like men—self-reliant and independent men—we must lift them out of the position of serfs. At home,

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

where there is no stimulus to industry, they may be languid, lazy, and improvident; abroad, it is well known, they are often among the most frugal and hardworking.

3. It is worthy the attention of a paternal Government to devise a system of emigration—not that the country is over-populated—but that a portion, at least, of the people may get a fresh start in life, and that their dormant energies may be roused by new surroundings, and by the prospect of independence. Besides, in some districts, the people are nearly all of one social position and one creed. There is hardly any middle class, such as constitutes the bone and sinew of other countries. In the colonies there are vast regions waiting for the plough, and promising a splendid return to the sons of toil. What a revolution to a family living in absolute dependence and penury, without a ray of hope to gild the future, to be transferred to such a country as Canada, or Australia, or New Zealand, or the United States!

4. In room of these emigrants, Ireland is in sore need of a few colonists from England and Scotland,—men of industry and enterprise and some capital,—men who could occupy an intermediate position between the great landowners and what we may call their serfs,—men who would give employment, and show the people what might be achieved by self-reliant energy. In some parts of the country, such a class is hardly known. There is no social bridge between the very lowest and the higher classes. For their own sakes, the landowners should induce this class to seek a home in Ireland. Instead of this, we have some reason to fear that such of them as did venture across the Channel have been rather discouraged, and are fast disappearing.

5. After all, it is “righteousness that exalteth a nation.” This strikes at the root of all evil. This, above all things, is what Ireland needs—the healing power of the grace of God. We have spoken of the social condition of the people, but what is their spiritual condition? Three-fourths of them have been under the dominion of the Pope more absolutely than any people in Christendom—than even the Italians themselves. Under that dominion they have been spell-bound. What hope can we cherish that they will become a free and happy people? It is hard to get at the heart and conscience of Irish Catholics. The memory of centuries of oppression clings to them. Their spiritual guides play upon their prejudices, and manage to keep them ignorant of the Word of God. Till the national-school system was introduced, many of them never heard that there is in existence such a book as the Bible, and till this day millions of them have never seen it. Their ideas of the Reformed faith (if they have any) are gathered from a Church which has ever been intensely *political*, and which they regarded as the symbol of their national humiliation.

How are these people to be reached by the Word of God? This is the difficulty felt deeply and keenly by all who have aimed at their evangelisation. In the first place, there must be some means or other taken

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

to make them feel that Protestants are not the enemies of their race and country; that those who seek their conversion are not identified with intolerance and tyranny; but that, on the other hand, they are sympathisers, and aim at their temporal as well as their spiritual welfare. Further, the true faith must be presented as a *living* reality before their eyes—as tolerant, gentle, pure, loving, and animated with intense compassion for the oppressed; or in other words, those who profess the apostolic faith must show the power and moral grandeur of that faith in their lives. A Protestantism that is political rather than spiritual, that is exacting and supercilious, that approaches the hearers in the spirit of caste, is not likely to make way with a people who, while they are genial and generous, are intensely sensitive.

There is a way to the Irish heart which neither priest nor so-called patriot can block up. The Irish race are keenly alive to kindness, especially from those in a higher social grade. It has been already stated that it is an instinct of their nature to render homage to learning, religion, and rank. Even centuries of oppression and supercilious contempt, and a burning sense of wrong, have not extinguished that instinct. Approach them as brethren, fellow-countrymen—offer the kindly greeting—enter with genuine sympathy into their feelings—listen to the stories of their injured race, and you will secure a response and welcome.

Even on the subject of religion they are not inaccessible; but if you outrage their prejudices, attack the dogmas they hold most sacred, and hold up to ridicule what is most surely believed among them, you effectually shut the door. Perhaps, indeed, it is impossible to overthrow such a gigantic system of imposture as the Papacy without controversy, but do not begin with controversy. See how Christ, in the first instance, avoided controversy with Nicodemus and the woman at the well. We have much in common with earnest Roman Catholics. They believe, as we do, in the Trinity—in the deity of the Son of God—in the atonement—in eternal rewards and punishments—in a general judgment—and, above all, in the love of God to sinners. They do not express themselves in all these doctrines as we do, but on any one of them they are ready to converse, *if we approach them in a kindly spirit*. Speak of the Pope as Antichrist, of the worship of Mary as idolatry, of the abominations of the Mass, and you may be thankful if they do not crack your crown. Speak to them of the dying love of Jesus, of the need we all have of pardon, and in nine cases out of ten they will listen with gratitude and respectful attention. Touch with the finger of sympathy the springs of earnest natural devotion, found deep in the heart of most of the Irish race, and you will find a generous response.

As I hinted in a former communication, there are gleams of hope in the horizon. The dense cloud is rising. The superstition of ages is breaking up in many quarters. The supremacy of the priest in all matters, civil and sacred, is being questioned. No doubt, the people are watched and

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

guarded and waylaid by all the subtle and enslaving machinery which the priest knows so well how to employ, but his absolute and unquestioned authority is gone. Men are beginning to relegate his functions to the spiritual, and even then to ask a reason for what he imposes. The laity are not allowed to enter a Protestant place of worship, or listen to a Protestant minister, or join in family worship with Protestants, and yet the truth sometimes reaches and saves them.

Ireland just now is in a transition state. The spirit of inquiry is abroad. Men of intelligence and self-respect are impatient of mere human infallibility and priestly dictation. There is imminent danger of the rebound, as in Continental countries, to absolute infidelity. The call to the Protestant Churches is loud and urgent. We want a race of earnest, able men in all our pulpits—men full of faith and the Holy Ghost. And we want, not less urgently, that all our people so live in the face of their countrymen as to commend the Gospel, and show by gentleness, by purity, by love what the true religion of the Cross can achieve. But, apart from the stated ministry, as it appears to me, there is a splendid opening for two agencies of a special kind. These are *evangelists* and *colporteurs*. No greater boon could be conferred on our unhappy country, in the present transition state of religious feeling, than a band of evangelists—men of popular gifts, sound sense, intense sympathy with the masses of the people—men in no way identified with political parties, and who would eschew irritating controversy—men of great spiritual power, who would rouse whatever is torpid in existing Churches, and hold up Christ to the perishing multitude outside all the Churches.

Then the country should be flooded with Christian literature. Almost universally, the people have acquired the art of reading; but, unhappily, their thirst for knowledge is met by the wretched national press—the exciting, misleading, corrupting weekly papers, which trade upon their prejudices, and fan their hatred of England. The paucity of bookshops in the smaller towns of Ireland is absolutely incredible. The weekly paper, the legends of the saints, and the most trashy and debauching of the London penny journals, constitute the literary pabulum of the majority of the people. We are in sore need of a pure and healthy Christian literature. A bookshop should be opened in every town in Ireland, and half-a-dozen colporteurs told off for every county. Such men would readily find access where no parson dare show his face. Such men, armed with *attractive illustrated* books and periodicals, not so much controversial as Christian, would do a thriving trade in every part of the land. What a blessing British and American Christians, who are deeply touched by the miseries of Ireland, would confer on the country, by sustaining a hundred such men; and how trifling the expense, compared with the harvest that would be gathered! It would be easy to form such an agency of humble, earnest men—men mighty in the Scriptures, and thoroughly acquainted with



CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

the wants and feelings of the people. Just now, there is a famine from want of the bread that perisheth. How readily the cry is answered by every civilised nation! Money comes pouring in from America, the Colonies, the Continent of Europe, and even far-distant India. O that Christian men in all these lands would realise the chronic famine of the bread of life, by which millions of the Irish people have been left to perish from one generation to another! The social condition of the people is the occasion of intense and universal sympathy. Is the soul of less account than the body? For lack of knowledge, the people perish. Will no man lay it to heart?

ROBERT KNOX.

## NOTES OF THE DAY.

## A NEW FIELD FOR BIBLICAL EXPLORATION.

WHERE next? Egypt has been explored, though material almost endless remains to be translated; Assyria has been explored, Midian has been explored, and Moab, and Palestine, and Sinai; what part of Biblical territory can furnish a new field? The new field is certainly where few would have fancied; the new people, of whom we may expect to hear a great deal in coming years, are none other than the sons of Heth, of whom Abraham bought a field and a cave for the burial of his dead. Recent investigations, both in Egyptian and Assyrian remains, have brought to light the fact that the Kheta were a great people at a very early period, forming a confederacy of small kingdoms that extended from the wilderness and Lebanon to the Euphrates (Josh. i. 4)—the great power of Syria and Mesopotamia, indeed, previous to the rise of the Assyrian Empire. Those familiar with derivations will at once see the identity of Kheta, Heth, Hittite. It is this Hittite people of whose early greatness recently discovered inscriptions give us such emphatic information. Their two principal cities were Kadesh, on the Orontes, and Carchemish, on the Euphrates. It is believed that many records of the history of this people, with whom, from the age of Abraham downwards, the Hebrew people had close relations, may be found in these places. Indeed, excavations have been carried on during the last two years at Carchemish for the British Museum, which have resulted in the discovery of sculptures and inscriptions. As yet the inscriptions remain an enigma, as no key has hitherto been discovered for the character in which they are written. The hope of finding a key must lie in the collection of additional specimens, as thereby a result may be reached similar to that which the Rosetta Stone supplied for the hieroglyphical inscriptions, and the monuments examined by Professor Grotefend for the cuneiform inscriptions of Assyria.

Professor Sayce, of Oxford, Dr. Birch, and other authorities in Biblical archaeology, are of opinion that, if the Hittite monuments shall be deciphered, a new volume of ancient history will be opened, bearing on many events mentioned in the Old Testament. Professor Sayce has lately written:—"I feel convinced that some of the most important and interesting discoveries that await us are to be made in the old country of the Hittites."

A proposal has been made, the source of which is Edinburgh, to raise a fund for enabling a gentleman, who stands high as an archaeological explorer in connection with the Palestine Expedition, to proceed to examine the mounds in the two great cities of the Hittites. The proposal is one that concerns the whole Christian world, and ought to receive its support and countenance. We hope, though not without anxiety, to hear soon that it is crowned with success.

## PROFESSOR BLACKIE ON PRESBYTERIANISM.

It has always been one of the not unkindly foibles of the eccentric Professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh to pay a great deal of attention to the business of the clergy. He understands it so perfectly that he is quite prepared to revolutionise it to-morrow after his own faultless ideal. Never a season passes but he propounds some scheme of reform, which, if the clergy would only adopt it, would increase the efficiency of the Church a thousandfold. At the heart of his suggestions there is usually a kernel of good sense; but this is more than neutralised by the recklessness of his method, too like the bull in a china-shop, his contempt for traditions and old associations, and the tone of mingled levity and reality that leaves those who do not know the man at a loss to tell whether he has a serious purpose, or is only jesting at large. The Professor is constantly preaching to the clergy that they ought not to preach so much, because the country is flooded with sermons—yet he seems to think that, notwithstanding, there is ample room for his own. Here is the poetical text of his latest lecture:—

“Art thou a Presbyterian, stout to stand  
 On thine own legs, and breathe thy proper breath,  
 With proud revolt disdaining high command,  
 To shape thy prayer, or mould thy sturdy faith?  
 Or art thou sworn to ceremonial grace  
 Of Prelacy, and Bishops’ fair control,  
 With a smooth speaker in the Preacher’s place  
 Sweetly to soothe, not rudely stir the soul?  
 Friend, I am neither—being both—why should  
 Each in his way not serve my pious need?  
 The fervid preacher in his thundering mood,  
 The mild-mouthed clerk, when he intones his creed?  
 I claim them both—my left hand and my right  
 Bound to one body’s use—why should they fight?  
 “JOHN STUART BLACKIE.”

The sermon he preaches on this text is to the effect that, now that the foolish and wicked attempt of the Episcopalians in the seventeenth century to cram Episcopacy down the throats of the Scottish people is past and gone, the two Churches should shake hands with each other, and take lessons out of each other’s books. He does not explain how Presbyterians are to shake hands with a Church that, by denying the validity of its orders, gives it no hand to shake. Then he urges that Presbyterians should reform their worship. Some things suggested are well and wisely put; but the chief point is, that in each church there should be but one sermon in the fortnight! The propounding of such a revolutionary idea compels us to conclude either that the professor is joking (which we cannot think), or that he is so preposterously unpractical in his notions, that his advice must always tend to produce the very opposite effect to that intended. It is quite true that the amount of work required of the modern clergy, and especially the amount of preaching, is far too great; but it would be absurd to suppose that a sermon in the fortnight would be sufficient, or that all the clergy would preach better if they had no more preaching to do than this. He complains of the number of common-place sermons. But the men who have never anything particular to say would be as common-place once a-fortnight as they are twice a-week. It is the full heart, the quick eye, the soul eager to do good, that preaches freshly. Mr. Phillips Brooks, of Boston, whom we should suppose to be a man after Professor Blackie’s heart, ridicules the notion of preaching at long intervals. Men that can preach at all will preach better at short intervals than at long.

After all, these amateur-reformers show very clearly how little there often is between the sublime and the ridiculous. They start sublime theories, but hardly bring forth even a ridiculous mouse. Professor Blackie recently exemplified his ideas on preaching reform by delivering a sermon on a Sabbath evening on the

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

reform of the land laws! There is a spiritual world, a true and real spiritual life, for estimating whose forces he appears to have no atom of skill.

# ANGLICAN VIEWS OF SABBATH-KEEPING.

One of the most respectable and talented of the English Church papers, in a recent letter from a correspondent in a town in France, gives the most extraordinary reasons which it has ever been our fortune to meet with, for plunging into the dissipations of the Carnival on the Lord's Day. We quote the passage:—

"And now there came a momentous question and a solemn disputation at our *table d'hôte*, whether or no, as conscientious Christians and as loyal Churchmen, we could give our countenance to the grand *début* of the Carnival, which was announced for Sunday, at 2 p.m. The ladies and gentlemen on the opposition benches, or chairs, expressed their opinions that the Carnival was pagan, Popish, ritualistic, pantomimic; and, though it might be excusable to laugh at it on a week-day, it would be inconsistent and profane on the Sabbath to take any part in such proceedings. There were some of us who maintained, on the contrary, that they who, in obedience to the directions of the Church of England, regarded Friday as a fast, might regard Sunday as a festival, and having joined in the highest act of worship and other services of their Church, might avail themselves without hesitation of an opportunity, which might not recur, of witnessing a ceremony, religious in its origin, and still bringing much innocent pleasure to large assemblies of people, including many thousands of working folks, whose cares are many, and whose holidays are few.

"Going down on Sunday, accordingly, from my hotel to Nice for our early celebration, I heard the incongruous sounds of cannons booming (*salves d'artillerie*), and bells ringing for Mass, and saw the *paysans*, in their best coats and gayest kerchiefs, coming down from their mountain homes to the *fête*. At 2 p.m., with my mask and note-book in readiness, and my pencil so finely pointed, that I felt proudly sure the world would say, '*Rem acu tetigisti*,' I took my seat on the Grande Tribune in front of the Prefecture, the best place for seeing the spectacle, because there is located the committee, and before the committee all the actors halt to be scrutinised, with a view to the adjudication of the prizes. The day was warm and cloudless, the eye was pleased with brilliant colours and the ear with jubilant music, when a great gun gave the signal, and on came the Carnival!"

The ceremony, "religious in its origin!" consisted of the unmitigated buffoonery of the Carnival. The same strange reasoning would sanctify Sunday theatres, for stage plays are "religious in their origin," and many other kinds of gaiety and dissipation. In the same paper, another correspondent describes a brilliant ball in the Conversation House at Baden-Baden on a Saturday, which lasted till five o'clock on Sunday morning, simply remarking that it is a pity that that day is chosen. Those who believe in the Divine authority of the Sabbath must see how little help they have to look for from High Churchism in maintaining the sacred day.

## THE LATE MR. LENNOX, OF NEW YORK.

With much emotion we call attention to the death of Mr. James Lennox, a godly Presbyterian patriarch, at the ripe age of eighty, full of alms-deeds, and other good works, a man of princely fortune, and of princely heart in the disposal of it. The American papers speak of him as having virtually, through his benefactions, founded the Boards of Publication and of Church Erection, and done hardly less for the Board of Foreign Missions.

"His gifts through the collections of the first Presbyterian Church, New York, to this Board, were about \$5000 a-year, and from \$10,000 to \$15,000 a-year of personal gifts. It is estimated that his gifts to the Presbyterian Hospital in New York, the Philipps Memorial Church, the Presbyterian Home for Aged Women, and to the Lennox Library have amounted to over \$2,000,000. In addition to this, he built two spacious library buildings for Princeton Theological Seminary, and two handsome houses for the use of professors in that seminary. Princeton College shared also in his generous gifts. Indeed, the whole of his abounding liberality cannot be told, for much of it he modestly concealed from human sight. It was a noble life, filled with good deeds, and ending in peace and submission to God's will."

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

Besides benefactions in America, Mr. Lennox was a most generous giver abroad. The library of the New College, Edinburgh, owed to him some princely benefactions, and he was one of the great helpers of Dr. Chalmers in his West Port enterprise. In Dr. Chalmers' "Life and Correspondence" there are letters not a few indicating Mr. Lennox's hearty appreciation of his aims, and most generous and thoughtful, yet modest, contributions towards the achievement of them.

#### THE COMING PHILADELPHIA COUNCIL.

We are receiving letters from time to time indicating the great interest which the coming Council at Philadelphia is exciting in remote localities. The distant British Colonies are evidently looking on it with lively interest. Our latest letter is from Hobart Town, Tasmania, indicating the appointment of a delegate from the Presbyterian Church of that colony. Everything shows that the formation of the Presbyterian Alliance has not taken place a day too soon, and especially that the weaker, more distant, more struggling Churches, are looking up to it as the "big brother," who will back them and encourage them in their arduous struggle.

Some time ago, a short schedule of queries was sent from the committee on statistics, with a request that answers might be sent in to the Convener, 9 Palmerston Road, Edinburgh, not later than July. We are somewhat afraid that in some quarters this request may be overlooked, and that the materials for a correct statistical return may not be complete. We beg, in this form, to request special and early attention to the schedule.

W. G. B.

## GENERAL SURVEY.

### THE ENGLISH NONCONFORMISTS.

IN our last number we gave some notes of the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland and the Church of England. We now proceed to give some account of the work of the English Nonconformists.

The active part which Nonconformists have taken in the political agitations of our time, and which they were really compelled to take, for the acquisition of rights which had, long and most unjustly, been withheld from them, has no doubt given them a sort of tendency to general activity, not easily managed, and certain not to be confined to one sphere of action or thought. Perhaps this at least partly explains the readiness with which English Nonconformity, and especially its Congregationalist section, has been carried away by new views of Christian doctrine. To what extent this is the case it is not easy to ascertain. But probably there has been some exaggeration in statements which have been made, and fears which have been expressed. "The Evangelical Dissenter," says the last number of the *Congregationalist*—and we may suppose it speaks with special reference to Congregationalists—"has no real sympathy with what may be considered the distinctive points of Broad Churchism. . . . He trusts in the sacrifice of Calvary, he worships the risen Christ, he believes in the quickening and indwelling of the Spirit, he receives the Bible as the one rule of his faith and practice."

The first number of the *Nonconformist and Independent*, the most important organ of the Congregationalist Church, strikes the same key. It professes itself "a steadfast supporter of the fundamental verities of the Christian faith." "The decline of definite faith," it says again, "in things spiritual, has always resulted in the decline of the party of progress and justice." . . . "Whatever weakens the hold of Christian people on the personality of the Divine nature, on the reality of God's government, or on the dread certainty of

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

judgment to come, weakens also the action of conscience, both in the sphere of individual and national life. . . . It is men who substantially believe in their Bibles, with a solid grip upon the supernatural, in miracles, prophecy, and history, with a certain taste for dogma,—that is, for definite belief—and a fixed resolve to abide by apostolic discipline in their churches—it is such as these that have ever proved the strength of the party of justice and peace in the state. . . . It cannot be too strongly impressed on the younger generation, that future victories of public right can be won only by men, for the most part, of the ancient stamp in their spiritual faith." These words have the "true ring" in them. They give us some assurance that among the descendants of the Puritans there is a backbone of evangelical orthodoxy.

Notwithstanding the immense development of religious and intellectual energy in the Church of England, Congregationalists seem to hold their own well in the great towns; and of Nonconformity in general—including, of course, its Congregational branch—it is asserted that "it does by far the best half of the work that is done to instruct and to uplift the peasant population of the country." We are glad to see earnest endeavours being made to raise the qualifications and the stipends of Congregational ministers. There is evidently a strong feeling that something more must be done in this matter than in the past, and that to secure an efficient and educated ministry, well spread over the country, some great central aid-fund must be established. At the same time, there seems to be also the conviction that a more thoroughly organised system of lay preaching is absolutely necessary. This is a very prominent topic of discussion at present. Of the 5200 Congregational Churches, only some 1300, it is said, have "stations," though a considerable number of these have more than one station, and not more than 1000 lay preachers take part in supplying them. This, it is urged, is far from satisfactory; and earnest endeavour must be made to increase the lay preaching power, as well as the clerical.

Church extension does not lag in the Congregational Church, for during the last quarter of a century it has built 540 places of worship, accommodating 250,000 persons. The contributions to the Chapel Building Aid Fund for the present year amount to £10,000, and some of these subscriptions are of notable liberality, one being of £1000 a-year for five years, and another of £500, with a promise of £5500 to follow. At a meeting in London the other day, Mr. Richards, M.P., gave an interesting account of Nonconformist Church Extension in Wales. In 1775, the Nonconformists in the Principality had 171 churches; in 1816 they had 993; in 1851 they had 2826; in 1871 they had 3407, and this exclusive of the increase of the Wesleyans and some other smaller bodies. In other words, the Welsh Nonconformists have about three times as many churches as the Church of England. The continued vigorous existence and extensive operations of the London Missionary Society, which is, we believe, chiefly supported by Congregationalists, are proofs of its vitality and strength. Not to speak of what it has done in India, in South Africa, and in the islands of the Pacific, we have, for example, recent information of the notable work it is carrying on in Madagascar by means of native agencies—evangelists, pastors, teachers. Writing of an inspection he conducted last Autumn, Mr. Wills, one of the missionaries, gives such reports as the following:—"On the Faraony there are seven churches and schools." "Along the river Matetanana are large Taimoro towns, in many of which are congregations connected with Ambohipeno, and under the care of Rainiamboazafy and the pastors." "At Mahamanina the missionary found a class of twenty preachers, some of whom look after the country congregations." It seems a bold but interesting experiment, this leaving Christianity, one might almost say, to work its own way among a barbarous people. But is it not precisely here that modern missions have shown some want of courage? The London Missionary Society has not been behind in regard to Central Africa. At this time there are four missionaries at Ujiji, looking about for a suitable station, or waiting the decision in London with regard to that. The lamented Dr. Mullens



[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

was on his way to the shores of the Tanganyika, in connection with this, when he fell, truly a martyr in the work to which he had devoted his life. Mr. Arthington has, in addition to his former liberalities, offered £3000 for a steamer on the lake.

We are glad to see that the Baptists have rather more than kept their ground during the past year in respect of numbers. In England and Wales, their membership now amounts to 267,000, which must represent a great community, probably greater in proportion than is the case in other denominations. The increase—in all, between three and four thousand—seems, however, to be principally in London; for the London Baptist Association, which met the other day, returns, as the year's addition to the churches within their bounds, 2500, an increase-rate of six per cent. It is a singular fact, that,—though we should suppose the Baptists to have among them more than their proportion of the humbler classes, as they certainly have had more than their share of contempt from a haughty "culture,"—in no denomination have there arisen greater preachers. We hope it is the Baptist pulpit which explains their success in the capital. There is one pulpit there, as every one knows, which is world-famous, and which has exercised and is still exercising a direct influence on a greater number of human beings than ever has been the case in previous Christian history.

It was in the second quarter of the seventeenth century that the Baptists began to organise themselves into "separate societies" or congregations. One of the first, if not the first, was formed in London in 1633. It consisted of twenty men and women and "divers others,"—say half a hundred at the most. Another was formed six years later in the same city, in which "Green, the feltmaker, Marler, the button-maker, Spencer, the coachman, and Rogers, the glover," were the chief men "in the new talking trade." It was, in every way of it, the day of small things. Now, we are told, the Baptist Churches throughout the world have a membership of two millions and a-half. The Anglican Church, boastful of its orders, rich in endowments, in culture, and in worldly influence, might do well to lay it to heart. Green the hatter, and Roger the glover, and Quartermine the brewer's clerk, and the few humble people like them, have grown into a great community half as numerous as their haughty and powerful foe of other days, with all its branches and offshoots, which was too apt to regard all such as they, as but vermin to be trampled on or swept away. But the Baptist statistics have other points of interest besides this of the number of members. During the year, the Sabbath scholars have grown from 394,000 to 422,000, an increase of nearly 30,000; the Sabbath-school teachers have grown from 39,000 to 42,000, an increase of 3000. Unhappily, there is some falling off in the number of "pastors and evangelists," but however much this is to be regretted, the very fact that, notwithstanding, there are such statistics in other things to present, seems only the greater proof of a real religious life and working force in the denomination. While we differ from our Baptist friends on what we regard as matters of importance, we cannot but feel thankful that in times like these they can make such a good report of themselves. They have their own history and experiences; we Presbyterians may no doubt learn from them.

Here is a specimen of a living and working Baptist congregation. At the Annual Meeting of the Cannon Street Church, Accrington, it was reported to the following effect: "The members number 433. There are 141 Sunday-school teachers, and 1191 scholars connected with the church. The day-schools are still larger, reporting 1525 scholars. Fourteen preaching brethren supply the pulpits of three branch chapels. The friends contributed during the year £915 for congregational and school purposes, and £448 for denominational and kindred objects, making a total of £1363."

The several Methodist bodies in England have 3,600 ministers, 35,000 lay preachers, 40,000 class leaders, 658,000 church members, 12,000 Sabbath schools, 214,000 Sabbath-school teachers, and 1,400,000 Sabbath scholars. These are remarkable statistics. Though it no longer advances at the same rate as in earlier periods, English Methodism, it is evident, is still a great religious force. The

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

Wesleyans seem at present to be mainly taken up with the Thanksgiving Fund, through which their Church hopes to free itself from various weights and hindrances which at present impede its action. The success is already more than encouraging. The sum of £235,000 has been promised, and more than £80,000 has been paid. We have glanced over some of the contributions, as given in *The Watchman*. They bring out very strongly what, indeed, the name of the Fund may be held to imply, that thankfulness is a great element and force in Wesleyan Christian life. Here are some of them:—Mrs. B., £50, “for spared life”; Mr. and Mrs. H., £10 for God’s mercies “to us and ours”; Two Methodists, £30 for the spared lives of four dear children; Ebenezer, £20; for blessings received through local preachers, £50. Like the Wesleyans, the Puritans have always been a praising people. Cromwell’s Ironsides went into battle singing Psalms. The countrymen of Ayr and Clydesdale, when they drove before them, at Drumclog, the dreaded and redoubted Claverhouse, sang, as they advanced to the charge—

“In Judah’s land God is well known,  
His name’s in Israel great.”

An old Scotchman, even in private worship, regarded his act of devotion as imperfect without a psalm of praise to God. But the praise of the Puritan was more a praise of adoration than of gratitude. If it was, for that very reason, in some respects a nobler thing, yet, in its deficiency in that simple, hearty, trustful, joyful gratitude of Methodism, it had a serious want. Certainly, thankfulness has a great place in the Bible; and no grace gives forth a sweeter music of holy living and generous action under the wondrous touch of a gracious Providence.

An important subject, at present exercising Methodists, both in this country and in America, is the “Class Meeting.” Emphatically a Methodist institution—once a source of life and blessing—it threatens to fall into disuse. There is a great deal, in what is said upon the subject, as worthy of consideration by other Churches as by the Methodists. “A Church,” observes a Methodist journal, “is essentially defective in its arrangements and appliances, whatever the excellence of its teaching and government, that does not make some definite and organised provision for a freer, fuller commingling of Christian affection and sympathy than is to be found in simple association with the same public teaching or participation in the same public ordinances. Such fellowship, to be effective, must be frequent; to insure its being frequent it must be regular; to insure its being regular it must be organised. The class meeting exactly answered the demands of Christian fellowship.”

We have not space for more than a reference to Wesleyan missions. Eminently missionary from the very first, Methodism has in its system very much that is suited to the work of Christianising barbarous or semi-barbarous peoples. You feel that at once in reading the account of a recent meeting with his black local preachers, by an inspecting missionary among the Kaffirs. Successful in other West Indian islands, the Wesleyans have hitherto failed in Hayti. Only now, after years of weary working and waiting, it seems as if the stones were about to melt. “Last Sunday week,” says a missionary, “as I spoke simply of God’s love in His Son, the tears began rolling down a number of faces. That morning, for the first time, the classes were well attended.” At a village in British Guiana, we are told of a religious awakening, perhaps of rather a sensational type. “Fourteen persons came up to the rail, and in about ten minutes, they passed from seeking to finding.” But there have been good fruits. “Sixteen couples formerly living together unmarried have married, and are now members of the Church.”

While the Wesleyans have been so successful with their Thanksgiving Fund, there is a threatening, it would seem, of serious deficiency in the missionary contributions for the year. But in this they are only like their neighbours; for even the finances of the societies of the rich and richly-endowed Church of England are in a state which is far from satisfactory. The “Society for the Propagation

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

of the Gospel," under the special patronage of the bishops, and having a deep, if not the freest, purse to draw from, was reported, at the recent meeting, to be £20,000 behind. The Church Missionary Society, whose contributions, in amount, surpass any other, is also in difficulties. In a "special notice," it intimates the prospect of "another adverse balance." It speaks of "sterner measures" for "reducing expenditure," which, withal, are contemplated "with feelings amounting to sad bewilderment." Let us hope the darkest is past. But Churches and missionary societies must not, any more than individual Christians, expect always to be prosperous. Is the unbelief that is in the air, like a wide-spread malaria, weakening faith and relaxing spiritual energy, even where nothing "acute" comes of it?

W.

## BELGIUM.

By M<sup>rs</sup>. KENNEDY ANET.

WE continue our information on the religious situation in Belgium.

M. Paul Voituren, a barrister at the Ghent Court of Appeal, has published this year a most interesting work, which swarms with errors and prejudices, "The Religious Views of the Liberty Party." Confounding Christianity with Catholicism, he declares it to be hostile to liberty. "They affirm, it is true, that Jesus made a distinction between civil and religious society, between the State and the Church, which had no previous existence. But the texts upon which this statement rests have not really the meaning attributed to them; they relate to mystic and ultraidealistic notions introduced into Christianity by the Gnostics. On this point, the demonstration of modern criticism is complete."

The readers of *The Catholic Presbyterian* were, no doubt, not previously aware of this *evident* result of modern criticism! Neither liberal nor orthodox Protestantism finds grace in the sight of M. Voituren. M. Réville, who cannot be suspected of affection for orthodox Protestantism, has thought fit to stand on the defensive in articles addressed to the *Flandre Libérale*. M. Voituren wishes for Rationalist Churches, after the model, not of the English Rationalist Churches, in which there is but little philosophic spirit, and too many Protestant prejudices, but of an ancient institution—Freemasonry, which presided at the birth of modern society, and which gave it its immortal motto: *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity* (*Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité*). The *Flandre Libérale* better understands the situation and its needs:—

"We are much mistaken if persecution, besides giving birth, even in the smallest villages, to groups of resolute men, and thus reinvigorating the character of the whole nation, do not develop the tendency which has already appeared in more than one part of our country, to draw near to one of those great Christian sects, with whom the Gospel, reason, science, progress, and civilisation walk hand in hand, and which have elevated to so high a point the intellectual, religious, and moral level of the greatest nations of the world."

In another article, the same newspaper, speaking of the population rejected by the Church, says:—

"These will, perhaps, attach themselves to another faith. Protestant ministers and Old Catholic priests may possibly seize the opportunity to make proselytising efforts, which perhaps would not be unsuccessful. The moment might come when the State would find itself compelled, even by its constitution, to recognise dissenting Protestants or schismatic Churches, and to subsidise their ministers."

The opinion of M. Emile de Laveleye, the well-known professor at the University of Liège, must be noticed here. He has expressed it most clearly in two letters which appeared in the *Times* and in the *Daily News*. In the first of these letters, M. de Laveleye gives the three following reasons of the religious conflict in Belgium:—(1.) The Catholic Church, through its councils, Popes, and bishops, condemns modern liberty, which has originated with Protestantism; (2.) These liberties are less limited in Belgium than elsewhere; (3.) The Catholic clergy who

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

condemn them have greater influence, or are better organised in their method of action.

In the other letter, M. de Laveleye shows that the violent opposition of the priests against the new regulations affecting primary schools will cause the expulsion of a considerable number of people from the Roman Catholic Church. "In the large towns," writes the eminent professor, "the priests will not push matters to an extreme, for fear of losing three-fourths of the population; but in the country districts they will persevere in the hope of attaining their end, viz., the ruin of the communal schools. What is to become, religiously speaking, of the families thus expelled from the Church? They will gradually sink into free thought (*libre pensée*), in other words, into indifference and infidelity. Is not this, then, a fitting time for Protestantism to approach them and to say—'An intolerant Church, whose chief end is temporal power, casts you out; come to us, and accept a religion whose only basis is the Gospel, which respects liberty, which does not make the celebration of the sacraments a means of securing votes, and which does not hurl anathemas at the institutions of your country—a religion of truth, liberty, and charity?' Such language should be understood. Never have Protestant missions had such a chance of success, because the only issue open to the excommunicated Liberal, who does not forsake all faith, is to accept the Reformed faith. But labourers are needed to carry on this evangelical mission. The Belgian Missionary Church, which has already done so much good, will undertake to find the labourers, if only pecuniary aid is sent to it, and I hereby appeal most earnestly to the friends of the Gospel in England to forward such aid."

In point of fact, even if the Gospel inspire little but disdain among the aristocracy and men of letters, it finds, on the other hand, a sympathetic echo among the people. We are far from complaining of this fact; the Apostles' experience was the same, and Jesus foretold it should be thus. If the Reformation in this century is to be solid and durable, it must begin, not in the upper, but with the lower classes of society. Now, the twenty-five churches and stations of the *Eglise Chrétienne Missionnaire Belge* or *Société Évangélique*, composed, with rare exceptions, of converted Roman Catholics, contain scarcely any other than workmen and peasants; this is one of the reasons, be it said in passing, why the work of the committee which carries it on is often difficult, in a financial point of view. The forty-first report of the Society, which appeared this autumn, contains encouraging details respecting the internal progress of these Churches, and the evangelising work which they pursue. If their field of labour has not yet spread over the whole surface of the kingdom, it already occupies a very important part of it, from Ostend to Verviers and Spa, from Antwerp to the limits of the Borinage. A goodly number of the laity, workmen for the most part, hold meetings on Sunday evenings in private houses, and declare the truths of the Gospel to Romanists, who have been invited on Sunday afternoons by other members of the congregation, and by the distribution of tracts. Thanks to the zeal of those lay members who have added their labours to those of the pastors and evangelists, themselves too few in number for the requirements of the work, about *six thousand* sermons or addresses have been delivered during the administrative year 1878-79, in chapels, in public rooms, and in private residences, in cemeteries, and in the open air. Let us add the house-to-house visitations of the Scripture Readers, of the colporteurs, and of a great number of brethren, members of our churches; conversations in which the disciples of the Gospel speak of the Saviour's love, and of the need which each man has of Divine pardon and light. And 507,000 copies of the Holy Scriptures have been issued by the British and Foreign Bible Society at Brussels, since 1835, while four millions of tracts and religious books have been circulated by our Society. The seed sown has been freely spread, and new ground is broken up every day. The rich first-fruits, gathered each year, promise an abundant harvest. And all this work is not unfruitful; there is scarcely a church which does not annually gather new converts from Romanism. One congregation, for instance, has received this year twelve families from the Romish Church.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

These are not mere inscriptions, due to a more or less complete transit from Catholicism to Protestantism, but are, in many cases, solid conversions, in others the result of reflection and due consideration. These families are not inscribed in our list until we have been able to make sure of the seriousness of the step they are taking, by their regular attendance at worship during a more or less prolonged time of trial, sometimes six months, sometimes a year. Then those who leave the Romish Church have generally to undergo persecutions which, though not bloody, are none the less hard to bear.

Never, according to human ideas, has the field been clearer for the preaching of the Word of God. For many years, the work of extension had been slackening, almost stopping. During the past five or six years it has revived, and four new stations have been founded; many Churches which have but one pastor have developed and extended themselves to such a degree that they might advantageously be divided. For instance, thirty-eight years ago, there were no Protestants in Charleroi; about that time the Belgian Evangelical Society sent there an agent. In 1850 a church (temple) was built in the chief square of the town. The congregation has so largely increased that for several years the church has been too small; in summer the heat is so stifling that many persons are compelled to abstain from coming there to worship, as they cannot endure the vitiated atmosphere; and many Romanists go away because there is no room for them. A larger building has thus become an absolute necessity.\* The Protestant population of this congregation, inclusive of the children, numbers 1180 persons, all formerly Romanists. The Sunday school has 250 children, and 38 teachers, also formerly Romanists.

The inhabitants of the industrial centres, and of the rural parts of the Walloon country especially, are showing themselves increasingly in favour of Protestantism. The prejudice against the doctrine, teaching, morality, and character of evangelical Christians is constantly wearing away, and promises to disappear and make way for esteem and kindly consideration. The excesses of the Romanist clergy disgust the Roman Catholics with the teaching and action of their Church, and incline them towards Protestantism and, better still, towards the Gospel.

Wherever the Gospel is preached, whether in public or in private meetings, large audiences are obtained, full of attention and sympathy. It would be well that a larger number of pastors, evangelists, and Scripture readers should be employed; but we stand almost as much, if not more, in need of workers as we do of money. The great Presbyterian Churches of Scotland and of the United States, with which the little *Eglise Chrétienne Missionnaire Belge* rejoices in being affiliated, could they not, without self-injury, furnish a contingent of pastors to Catholic countries, to Belgium among others? These Churches send missionaries in great number to the British Colonies and to pagan countries. Would they not tighten the cords which already bind them to the weaker Churches of the Continent, by sending young men to study in the French theological colleges, with the view of becoming missionaries for Catholic countries? It would certainly not be more difficult for them to become masters of the French language, than to learn Chinese or other Pagan languages. The Romish Church educates young men whom she afterwards sends as priests to England, and perhaps to Scotland. Might not the great Presbyterian Churches educate young men to be afterwards sent as missionaries to Belgium and France? It is needless to add how useful this truly Protestant element would be to our young Churches, fresh from Romanism. We lay this idea, with all humility and confidence, before our brethren in Great Britain and the United States, feeling assured that, if it be in accordance with the Lord's will, it will sooner or later be realised.

\* A piece of ground, admirably situated, has been purchased for 30,000 fr., and the old church has just been sold for 48,000 fr. There remains thus 18,000 fr. to erect the new building. The cost of the new and larger church, inclusive of the furniture, will be 42,000 fr.; the congregation, whose members are nearly all poor working people, and consequently cannot give much, is thus in want of 24,000 fr., or 25,000 fr. (£1000). They must quit their present church on the 1st of August.



CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

## GERMANY.

THE *Protestantenverein* (rationalistic) has sent forth its testimony against the recent "First Prussian General Synod" in a pamphlet addressed to the German Churches. In answer to the question, "Whither must the way taken by the Synod lead?" it affirms, "The tendencies of this Synod are directed toward a hierarchical superintendence of the Church, and an enforced confessional Christianity. The way, moreover, leads to a denial of the spirit of the Reformation and the Union [between the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches], to an utter rejection of the Reformation spirit; for Reformation-Protestantism is the Christianity of subjectivity and freedom,—Christianity without any guardian hierarchy or confessional restraint." The third question of the pamphlet is, "What should we do?" and the answer is, "Agitate, for what else can we do now?" True to this principle, this Church-party seem resolved to agitate in the direction of the entire rejection of all doctrinal standards.

The *First General Synod of Schleswig-Holstein* met in the Church of St. Mary, at Rendsburg, on the 27th January, and held eighteen sittings, terminating its proceedings on the 14th February. It consisted of 78 members, of whom 27 belonged to the Left, 36 to the Right, and 25 to the Middle Party. Count Rantzau-Rastorf was chosen President, and the Consistorial President, Dr. Mommsen, was Royal Commissary, representing the Church authorities. A harmonious spirit pervaded the discussions, which dealt with almost the very same subjects which engaged the attention of the recent General Synod of the nine older provinces held at Berlin. The proposal to allow congregations to introduce a new hymn-book, which has been before the Churches of these provinces since 1869, was not adopted. The subject was remitted to a committee, consisting of three members of the Synod, and two members of the Consistory, with instructions to examine the 150 hymns of the Eisenach Conference, and the German military hymn-book, and report to the next meeting of the General Synod in 1882.

It seems that the *deficiency in the number of candidates for the ministry* has reached its turning-point in Germany. The Upper Consistory of Bavaria have issued an appeal to the congregations with reference to the present scarcity, concluding with an earnest admonition to parents to train their children in the faith of the Gospel, and to dedicate their sons to the service of the Lord in the ministry, as well as to pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth labourers. There are, under that Consistory, no fewer than 78 vacant ministerial charges, for which they can find no candidates. As in Bavaria, so is it, though not to the same extent perhaps, in other National Churches of Germany. It is therefore encouraging to find that, whilst in the Winter Semester, 1878-79, the number of theological students was only 1539, the number in the Summer Semester rose to 1945.

The *Mission Conference of the Province of Saxony* met this year at Halle, on the 4th of February, and was largely attended. Dr. Warneck, the founder of this "Conference," was President. An earnest missionary spirit characterised its proceedings. The speakers gave expression to their conviction that the German Evangelical Church had received a special call to engage in mission-work. This Church already occupies 320 different stations, and has 530 missionaries in the field. This is encouraging, but the painful fact was referred to that at present there exists a serious deficiency in the income of several of the missionary societies. The weakness of the German Church in this work was traced to the influence of Rationalism. Once, the congregations were believing, and the pastors unbelieving; now, this is reversed. The work of missions, it was felt, must now become more and more the great work of the Church. This great gathering, attended by the leading professors of the University, cannot fail to leave a deep impression on the minds of the students, who were present in great numbers, manifestly interested in the addresses delivered by such men as Dr. Wangemann, Professor Tschackert, and others.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

The statistics of the Grand Duchy of Hesse for 1878, recently published, furnish us with the following facts, bearing on the religious condition of that part of Germany:—The number of church-goers in the Province of Stackenburg is 15.5 per cent.; in Rhine-Hesse, 19.2 per cent.; and in Upper Hesse, 25.8 per cent.; while of communicants the numbers are, in these provinces respectively, 34.3, 50.0, and 82.4 per cent. of the evangelical population. In the manufacturing town of Offenbach, the number of church-goers is only 3.4 per cent., in Worms 6.6 per cent., and in Darmstadt 7.4 per cent. In these three towns, church matters are keenly discussed, and there are many clergymen there who are members of the *Protestantenverein*. In these three provinces, the number of civil marriages was 9.9, 14.3, and 1.0 per cent. respectively. In the three towns mentioned above, there were of civil marriages 38.6, 31.3, and 22.3 per cent. respectively.

The whole national Church comprehends about 598,923 souls (in 1877 the number was 600,368), of which 255,227 are in the Province of Stackenburg, 230,348 in Upper Hesse, and in Rhine-Hesse 113,348. In 1878 there passed over to the Evangelical Church 26 Catholics, 90 of other confessions, 32 of other religions, in all 150. Whereas, in the same year, there separated from the National Church 914 Old Lutherans, 47 Darbyites, 141 Baptists, 11 Temple-brethren, 3969 Free Protestants. There were 35 divorces, 158 suicides, and 286 cases of punishment inflicted on account of Sunday profanation.

There are at present only 26 theological students at Hesse, 6 of whom are not Hessians, a number far too small for the necessities of the Church; the prospects of an increase in this number are by no means cheering.

Dr. F. Benary, Professor of Theology, died at the advanced age of seventy-five, at Berlin, on 7th February. He lectured on Old Testament Exegesis and the Semitic languages and Palæography. His work, "*De Hebræorum Leviratu*" (1835), first brought him into prominent notice. He was a disciple of Gesenius, and in politics was an active member of the party of progress. His conversion to Christianity took place in 1829.

Dr. K. W. E. Nägelsbach, brother of the celebrated philologist, died at Gunzenhausen, in Bavaria, on the 9th of February. The Bavarian National Church has in him lost one of its most learned and eminent ministers. He was the author of several works of importance, the chief of which are "*Der Prophet Jeremias u. Babylon*" (1850); "*Was ist Christlich*," a course of polemical lectures (1852); "*Der Gottmensch*" (1853); "*Hebräische Grammatik*" (1860, third edition, 1870); and the Commentaries on Jeremiah (1868) and Isaiah (1877), for Lange's "*Bibelwerk*," well known to English students.

A Society for the "*History of Protestantism in Austria*" has recently been formed at Vienna. Its organ is a "*Jahrbuch*," to be published quarterly in Vienna. The President of this Society is Dr. Karl Ritter von Otto, Professor of Theology in Vienna, and the Secretary is Dr. Trautenberger, of Brünn. E.

## TURKEY.

### MISSIONS TO THE JEWS.

By the Rev. ALEX. THOMSON, Constantinople.

I PROPOSE here to offer a few observations on the arrangements of some of the missions in this country, confining myself for the present to those in European Turkey and Asia Minor. I have no intention of giving any sketch of the history of these missions, or even any detailed account of their present condition. My object is simply to point out some of their characteristic features; and I trust that such a review may not be unprofitable, especially as the Turkish Missions of the American Board have long been justly considered among the most successful in existence.

In the hands of our American brethren, Constantinople is the headquarters, more or less, of four distinct missions,—that of European Turkey, directed to the

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

Bulgarians south of the Balkan range, and in Macedonia; and those of Western, Central, and Eastern Turkey, directed principally to the Armenians, but providing also for the Greeks to some extent, both those speaking Greek and those speaking Turkish, and embracing every opportunity also of spreading the Gospel among the Mohammedans. The European mission is distinct from the rest, both as being located in a different territory, and as being directed to a people speaking a language almost unknown in Asia Minor. The other three missions, however, are directed to the same peoples. Turkish and Armenian are the great media of communication, the former, however, being printed in the Arabic, the Armenian, or the Greek alphabets, according as the printed works are intended for the use of Moslems, Armenians, or Greeks. The division into three missions may have some respect to language, that principally used in Central Turkey being the Turkish; but the arrangement seems to have been chiefly designed to avoid unwieldy assemblies at the annual meetings, to promote the dispatch of business, and perhaps to save the outlay involved in long journeys to the capital; for here I have to point out a prominent and most important feature of the American Missions in the fact that there are held, every year, synods of these various missions, at which all, or nearly all, the missionaries are present from every station. The expense involved in travelling (and they bring their families with them) must necessarily be very considerable; but I believe it is amply repaid in the refreshment the missionaries receive from conference with each other for some ten days, and not only so, but also in the thorough discussion that is given to the affairs of each station, as brought up in the annual report presented to the meeting by the missionaries attached to the several stations, the discussion of finance, and the ventilation of every proposal designed to be submitted to the Mission House in Boston. These are most important matters of business, and it is not too much to say that to these meetings may largely be ascribed the success of the missions. For not only are the missionaries themselves aided by each other's counsels, but the Prudential Committee in Boston, and the whole Board of Commissioners, receive from the resolutions and recommendations of these synods the most essential aid in the direction of the missions. Indeed, I do not hesitate to say that without them it would be simply impossible for any number of men in America, however learned, well-informed, intelligent, and devotedly pious they might be, to conduct missions successfully in this country, so distant and so entirely different in point of civilisation, and the way in which things must be done, from anything that is known in Britain or America. In fact, our esteemed brethren, though nominally Congregationalists, are in reality, in this respect, quite as good Presbyterians as any that are so called,—perhaps better than some. I may add that these annual meetings are, to a large extent, thrown open to Christian friends, and that in attending them I have often felt a near approach to the deep interest of our Assemblies in Edinburgh.

I would next observe that each station of these missions is a centre of light and influence to a large territory all around it. By this, I do not mean merely that the existence of a Protestant church in any locality is a testimony for the truth, and likely to become known more or less in the vicinity; I mean that from each station the missionaries and their assistants visit all the surrounding towns and villages, offering the Scriptures for sale along with other religious works, preaching the Gospel, seeking to establish schools, encouraging the people to meet together for worship, sending them, when necessary, helpers—that is, catechists or preachers, and seeking to nurse such out-stations into pastoral charges. The extent to which this is done may be inferred from the fact that, in the four missions referred to, while there were only 15 stations, as reported to the Board, in 1878, there were no fewer than 231 out-stations, 59 native pastors, 76 licensed preachers, 110 helpers, and 286 teachers; the American staff being 53 married missionaries and 30 unmarried female assistant-missionaries. Here, again, the outlay is necessarily great, and the labour still more so, for travelling is no easy matter in this country. Then it is implied that the missionary be not bound to his station by pastoral duty, but

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

that he be free to preach anywhere over his wide field; and, moreover, that he have at command an ample supply of Scriptures and educational and religious publications, and that he have constantly, under training, young men and women, who, by the Divine blessing, may be found suitable for occupying any post of usefulness that may be discovered, and these apart from such as may be designed as students for the ministry. To provide such an agency, as well as to promote education generally among the people, I find, from the same Report, that in these four missions the Board maintains five Theological Seminaries or High Schools, and six Female Boarding-Schools. There is thus provision made for a pure Christianity taking root, and propagating itself in this land.

I have spoken of religious literature; let us glance at what is done by these four missions in this direction. Publications are required in Armenian and Armeno-Turkish, in Greek and Greco-Turkish, in Turkish (Arabic characters) for Moslems, in Bulgarian, and in English. Details here would be extremely interesting, but a few figures are all that your space will admit. Besides issuing four weekly and four monthly journals, the latter being chiefly religious and designed for the young, the missions have published 115 religious tracts, 38 books on secular education, 41 educational works of a decidedly religious character for the use of students in theology and others, and 162 other religious works, small and large, such as commentaries, hymn-books, sermons, daily portions, church history, &c., &c. For the preparation of this constant supply of Christian literature, there are employed six missionaries in Constantinople, whose time is devoted almost exclusively to this department, aided, as they are, by about twice as many translators and press-correctors. This is altogether apart from those missionary committees for translating the Holy Scriptures, one of which translated the Bible into Bulgarian at the sole expense of the British and Foreign Bible Society; while another, of which Rev. R. H. Weakley, of the English Church Mission, was an important member, more recently executed a new translation of the Bible into Turkish, at the joint expense of the American and the British and Foreign Bible Societies.

Other very admirable arrangements of the missions might be pointed out, but for our present purpose we shall stop here, and simply observe, that we have in all this a fine specimen of *organisation*. Each mission-station feels that it is a part of a great whole; it receives weekly communications from the capital; its church and school are supplied with Bibles, hymn-books, and school-books from the capital; its people contribute according to their ability, and receive occasional aid from the capital; and all are made to feel that, as they have freely received, they are bound freely to give. One need not wonder that such an organisation, the growth of fifty years, developed and worked by Christian men of far more than average ability, has proved an invaluable blessing to this country. Indeed, while political movements have attracted more notice in the world at large, the real preparation of the people of this land for the future that awaits them, has been slowly and silently, but most efficiently, carried on for now seventy years by British and American Bible Societies and Missions, though some of these have been from time to time discontinued.

---

## UNITED STATES.

### REVISION OF PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

*By Rev. Dr. PITZER, Washington, D.C.*

DOUBTLESS all the members of the Presbyterian family will be interested in hearing of the revision of its Church Government, which has been very successfully accomplished by the Southern Presbyterian Church of the United States.

The Southern General Assembly, at its organisation in 1861, took up the revision of its Rules of Discipline (a revision which had been in progress several years before the division of the Presbyterian Church into North and South), and

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1890.]

enlarged the Committee, with instructions to include in its revision the Form of Government and the Directory of Worship.

After eighteen years of able, diligent, and faithful examination, discussion, and work, the revision has been so far completed: it includes the Form of Government and the Rules of Discipline. The Directory of Worship is still unfinished. The title of that which is already finished is "The Book of Church Order of the Presbyterian Church in the United States."

The vote upon the Book of Church Order by Presbyteries, as reported to the last General Assembly at Louisville, Kentucky, is as follows, viz. :—

1	Presbytery declined to vote.
In 1	" there was a tie.
8	Presbyteries voted for rejection of the revision.
58	" " adoption of "

The Southern Presbyterian Church, with its 1100 ministers, 115,000 members, and 1900 churches, has thus, by a most decisive vote, made a change in its fundamental law.

But let it be noted that this change is made, not because of any weakened belief in the Divine right of Church Government by Presbyteries, or any lessened attachment to Presbyterian order, but simply to bring our system, as we believe, into more complete harmony with the Presbyterian principles of the Word of God.

The very first line in the Book of Church Order affirms, "The Scriptural form of Church Government is that of Presbytery," a statement not found in the old book in such explicit terms. The seventh paragraph adds, "This doctrine is necessary to the perfection of the order of the visible Church, but it is not essential to its existence," which clause saves from the charge of exclusiveness. This revision has elicited the warmest approval of many of the ablest men in the Northern Presbyterian Church; nor is this to be wondered at, when we consider the time and labour spent in the work, and the character of the men engaged in it.

It is confidently claimed that all the great essential principles of Presbyterianism, as embodied in the old book, are retained in the revision. Thus, take the five heads of doctrine under which Church Government is comprehended—viz., 1st, The Church; 2nd, Its Members; 3rd, Its Officers; 4th, Its Courts; 5th, Its Orders. These are the same, as are also the methods of election, licensure, ordination, installation, and dissolution; so that we have made, not a *new* book, but a capital revision of the old. Some important changes have been made under the heads of Government and Discipline; these will now be presented, and some reasons given why they are thought to be improvements.

I. A FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE.—There is a most valuable principle stated thus in chapter v., section 2:—"All Church Courts are one in nature, not separate and independent tribunals; but they have a mutual relation, and every act of jurisdiction is the act of the whole Church, performed by its appropriate organ." This brings into view the truth that every court is essentially a presbytery; and that the distribution of powers to different courts is a mere matter of convenience and compact; and that every act of government, properly performed, is the act of the whole Church, and binding on the whole Church, until repealed by some higher court. The power of the whole is not only over, but also in, every part. This principle also makes prominent the oneness or unity of the Church, which is not an aggregate of units, but an organism, an organic whole.

II. THE EVANGELIST.—In the old book, under the head of officers, no mention whatever is made of this as one of the ordinary and perpetual officers of the Church by Divine appointment. There is an incidental mention of the office in chapter xv. The old book says, "The pastoral office is the first in the Church, both for its dignity and usefulness," a statement not maintained by Scripture. The office of pastor is for the Church in a settled state; the evangelist is for the whole world outside of the Church in this settled state.

The Book of Church Order assigns to the evangelist his proper work of



[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

preaching the Word, and administering the sacraments in foreign, frontier, and destitute regions; and confers upon him Scriptural authority, such as the evangelist Titus had, to organise churches. The office has not been magnified by Presbyterians; and this is due, in large measure, perhaps, to the meagre mention made of it in the Form of Government. Many, probably, did not feel called to be evangelists, because the standards of the Church declared that the pastoral office was first, both in dignity and usefulness. But in the Book of Church Order, the evangelist is made fully the equal, in all respects, of the pastor; and he has what the pastor, in virtue of his office, does not possess—the power to organise churches.

III. ORDINATION.—This, except when performed by an evangelist, is the declarative and authoritative act of a court, assigning a man to a definite work, to which the court believes the man has already been called by the Lord Jesus Christ; the court simply attests the fact upon its proper evidence. The ordination is not to an office, but to a work. As against all Popish and prelatical “Holy Orders” the doctrine is clearly formulated that “Ordination imparts nothing, whether character, power, grace, or privilege. It is neither a charm nor a commission; but a simple acknowledgment of what God has done. We do not put into the hands of ministers their warrant; we only set our seals to the credentials which God has given.” Such is the substance of the teaching on this subject in the Book of Church Order. With us there will be no more ordinations “*sine titulo*”—no more ordinations to a mere office; the ordination must always be a specific work. If a man is not called to a work, he has no right to the office. “He that desireth the office of a bishop desireth a good work.”

If ordination is not to the office, but to the work, an interesting question arises here, “May a man be ordained more than once?” The able Professor of Church Government in Union Seminary, stated, on the floor of the Synod of Virginia, that he “knew of no reason why a man might not be ordained at different times to different works, as pastor, evangelist, teacher, when called of God.”

IV. DEMITTING THE MINISTRY AND MEMBERSHIP.—This subject has more or less engaged the thoughts of Presbyterians at all times, but there has been no provision whereby a minister could lay aside his sacred calling, or a member, by his own act, with the concurrence of the court, cease to be a member.

Every one knows that there are men in the ministry and membership who ought not to be there, and that the courts were mistaken when they admitted them; yet there has hitherto been no method, except a judicial process, whereby these persons could cease to be ministers and members. Now, however, a two-fold provision is made in the Book of Church Order to meet such cases—cases in which a judicial process would be improper and impossible.

“When a communing member shall confess before the Session an unregenerate heart, and there is no evidence of other offences, the Court may transfer his name to the roll of non-communicating members. . . . But such action shall not be taken until after mature inquiry and due delay . . .” By this provision, relief is afforded to that class of persons who confess Christ, and come into His Church, deceived as to their state before God. Such persons acted in all sincerity and good faith, but finding out their mistake, are unwilling to come to the Lord’s Table, when they know they have no right there, as they cannot discern the Lord’s body.

Under the old law, a member would be brought under discipline for not doing what all well knew he had no right to do, viz. partake of the Lord’s Supper unworthily, not discerning the Lord’s body. As we have never claimed infallibility for either members or courts, there ought to be some provision for rectifying mistakes.

V. MINISTERIAL DEMISSION.—On the same general principles, it is provided that where it is evident to the minister himself, to the court, and to the Church, that God has not called him to the ministry, and that his ordination was a mistake, and therefore void, he may cease to be a minister—“the court may

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

divest him of his office without censure, and assign him to membership in some particular church." Three elements concur in the call of a man to the ministry: his own conscience, the call of the Church, and the judgment of the court. If, after ordination, all three of these elements are found wanting; if in his own conscience the man is not called, if he has no call from any quarter to preach, and if the court does not now believe that he is called of God,—then manifestly the man is not a minister, and the court ought to declare this, and not publish to the world in its minutes, year after year, that this man is called of God to the ministry when it is evident to every one that he is not.

VI. WHO SHALL VOTE FOR PASTOR?—Three separate and distinct rules were submitted to the Presbyteries, viz. :—

1st, Members and regular attendants, and contributors who are not members, may vote for pastor.

2nd, Only members may vote, but adult attendants and contributors, who are not members, may send up to Presbytery an expression of their wishes in the case.

3rd, Only communing members may vote.

The first, or the Broad Church Rule, received the vote of seven Presbyteries for its adoption.

The second, or the Mixed Rule, received the vote of but one Presbytery.

The third, or the Scriptural Rule, that only Christ's subjects may vote for spiritual officers in His spiritual kingdom, received the votes of forty-three Presbyteries, and was adopted.

Fourteen Presbyteries sent up no official record of their vote. If the vote of these fourteen Presbyteries was in the same proportion, for and against, as those sent up, then there would be two for the first rule, and twelve votes for the third rule,—making fifty-five for the third rule. When this rule was incorporated in the Book of Church Order, the final vote on its adoption as a whole was fifty-eight out of 68 Presbyteries.

Or if we apply the general rule "That members not voting shall be counted as voting with the majority," then it was the mind of the Church, as expressed by an overwhelming majority, that only those who profess allegiance to the Lord Jesus have any right to vote for His pastors.

Under the old rule, previous to the division of the Church, in many congregations, perhaps a majority of them, all regular attendants who contributed to the support of the pastor (but who were not communing members) had been granted, as a constitutional right, the privilege of voting for pastor. Now, however, in the Southern Church, by the large majority as given above, it is the established law that no one who does not profess allegiance to the Lord Jesus can vote for any officer in His Church. And it is strange that any other rule than this should ever have obtained in the Church. For,—

(a.) There is not one case recorded in the New Testament where an "outsider" was permitted to vote for a church-officer.

(b.) The voice of God's people is an important element in determining the question of a call to the ministry; but if unspiritual "outsiders" are allowed to join in the vote, we do not have the mind of the Spirit speaking through God's people.

(c.) There are but two classes—Christ's friends, and His enemies. Shall the latter, because they pay money and come to church, have the same rights with His friends?

(d.) The old rule denied to the "outsider" the right to vote for elders, yet the pastor is the first of elders, and moderator of the session.

(e.) No state, institution, corporation, company, or partnership allows "outsiders" to vote in the election of officers. Why should it be esteemed a wrong done to "outsiders" for the Church to act upon a universally received principle?

These and other reasons were urged in the discussion of this question, and, doubtless, had their due weight in its settlement. We hail with joy the establishment of the principle that money and attendance will not procure the elective franchise in the Southern Presbyterian Church.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1880.]

There are other important changes, nearly all of them, as we think, improvements on the old book. Of these, we may mention—the relation of the infant seed of believers, and the relation of baptised persons to the Church; full directions for the organisation of *churches*; a fuller statement of the duties of ruling elders and deacons; clearer provisions for dissolving the relation between elders and churches; the definition of an offence; and the methods of complaints and appeals.

Meantime, we would be glad to have our brethren procure copies of the book, and compare the work of our Assembly with other Churches.

## OPEN COUNCIL.

### THE DESCENT INTO HELL.

*To the Editor of "The Catholic Presbyterian."*

THE excellent article on the Descent into Hell, in the March number of *The Catholic Presbyterian*, appears incomplete from the want of the right exposition of 1 Peter iii. 19—"By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison." The article successfully shows what this text does *not* mean, but is hardly full enough in explaining what it *does* mean.

Let us observe *by whom* Christ preached, and *when*. Not in person, but *by the Spirit*; not after His crucifixion, "but *when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah.*"

A distinguished preacher has interpreted the words, "*by the Spirit,*" of the human spirit of the Lord Jesus; but I know no passage where any act is attributed to the human spirit of the Lord Jesus, separate from His Godhead.

If it was the spirit or soul of the Lord that preached, it must have gone into prison—*i.e.*, into hell, and not into paradise, where he told the dying thief he was to be with him that very day.

The spirits to whom He preached were "*disobedient,*" and "*in prison.*" It is contrary to the whole tenor of Scripture to suppose that our blessed Lord went to hell and saved disobedient spirits. It seems to be the special work of the Holy Spirit, first to create the human nature of the Lord (Luke i. 35), and then to quicken it from the dead (1 Pet. iii. 18; Rom. viii. 11). The Spirit who "*quickeneth*" or raised Him from the dead was the same Spirit "*by whom He preached,*" impersonally, so to speak, before His coming. Peter taught that "*the Spirit of Christ,*" which was *in the Prophets,*" testified (1 Pet. i. 11); and here he teaches that the same Spirit of Christ "*strove with man,*" as we are told in Gen. vi. 3, by the mouth of Noah, whom he calls "*a preacher of righteousness*" (2 Pet. ii. 5) for a hundred and twenty years, "*while the ark was a-preparing.*" Those to whom he preached were sometime—*i.e.*, aforetime—"disobedient," and are now "*in prison.*" The whole passage may be paraphrased thus:—"Christ, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit, by which He went and preached formerly to those disobedient spirits, at the time when the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah. They are now in prison."

This interpretation is in accordance with all Scripture doctrine, which the Romish or Patristic interpretation is not.

H. C. M.